BEFORE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of		
Application by SBC Communications Inc. for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin	)	WC Docket No. 03-167

DECLARATION OF
KAREN W. MOORE AND TIMOTHY M. CONNOLLY
ON BEHALF OF AT&T CORP.

August 6, 2003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the Matter of Application by SBC Communications Inc. for Authorization To Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in the States of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin	)	WC Docket No. 03-167

DECLARATION OF
KAREN W. MOORE AND TIMOTHY M. CONNOLLY
ON BEHALF OF AT&T CORP.

---

1. My name is Karen W. Moore. My business address is 222 W. Adams Street, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

2. I am employed by AT&T Corp. as Manager, Performance Measures, in Local Services and Access Management. In my position, I am responsible for the business relationship with SBC Communications Inc. ("SBC") as it relates to SBC's performance as a wholesale provider of unbundled network elements. Those responsibilities include negotiating performance metrics with Ameritech and Southern New England Telephone ("SNET") for the purpose of facilitating local market entry by AT&T.

3. AT&T is currently providing local exchange service through the UNE platform ("UNE-P") to residential customers in six SBC states, and business local service in nine SBC states.

4. Since June, 1999, I have represented AT&T in all performance measure collaboratives in the Central Region. I negotiate performance metrics with SBC/Ameritech for inclusion in interconnection agreements. I also compare and analyze AT&T results with SBC/Ameritech Account Team members who support performance issues.

5. Prior to assuming my present duties, I held assignments at AT&T Corp. in Consumer Services as a Strategic Pricing Manager, in Law and Government Affairs as a Docket Manager in Illinois, and a variety of business account management positions of increasing responsibility, beginning in 1989 as Account Executive and ending as Sales Manager.

6. I am a 1986 graduate of the College of Liberal Arts at Boston University, where I received a B.A. in Psychology with a minor in Philosophy.

7. Since 1999, I have attended either in person or via telephone conference bridge, every performance measures collaborative affecting the performance measures in the four SBC/Ameritech states in SBC's application. I provided AT&T's perspective and input on every measure discussed.

8. I have attended either in person or via telephone conference bridge every six month performance measure review collaborative meeting. I have submitted proposals for

modifications to the performance measures currently in place and assisted in the development of the parties' joint motions for approval of metrics changes.

9. I have attended either in person or via telephone conference bridge meetings held to discuss the development of the BearingPoint Master Test Plan. I have also assisted in the development of each change request to the Master Test Plan that AT&T has advocated. I have also attended meetings where findings by BearingPoint and Ernst & Young were discussed.

10. I have testified on performance measure issues before the MPSC in Docket No. U11830, and before the Illinois Commerce Commission in Docket Nos. 01-0120 and 01-0539. I have also submitted affidavits in the Ohio and Wisconsin Ameritech Section 271 proceedings focusing on performance and remedy plan issues.

11. My name is Timothy M. Connolly. I am a business systems analyst. Currently, I operate the consulting firm of C2 Technology Analysts ("C2TA"). My company is located at 2005 Arbor Avenue in Belmont, California. I have degrees from Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska, and from the University of Illinois at Chicago.

12. In my current capacity as a business systems analyst, I serve as a consultant to AT&T concerning OSS, third-party testing of the OSS of incumbent local exchange carriers ("ILECs"), ILEC Change Management Processes ("CMP"), incumbent-to-competitor testing procedures, and performance measurement systems. I have consulted with AT&T on OSS matters for more than six years.

13. Prior to starting C2TA, I worked for technical consulting companies and partnerships that were engaged to evaluate and recommend technology platforms for communications carriers, including incumbent OSS offerings. Several of these consulting assignments have involved the OSS obligations of ILECs under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and, in particular, State and federal regulatory commission requirements for the operational readiness of OSS to meet Section 271 checklist requirements. I have testified on the OSS capabilities of incumbent carriers across the country in State and federal proceedings, including the proceedings before this Commission involving Ameritech Michigan's 271 application, Bell Atlantic's Section 271 application for New York, Southwestern Bell's Section 271 application for Texas, the three Qwest multi-state Section 271 applications, and the SBC Michigan applications. Prior to becoming a consultant, I worked for AT&T for fourteen years in a variety of capacities, including management of an international systems integration business unit that developed software packages of business and network support systems for domestic and overseas customers of AT&T.

14. My work for AT&T on Ameritech's OSS third-party testing began in 1999 with the Ohio and Illinois Commission proceedings on the SBC-Ameritech merger conditions where the Commission established conditions of approval based in part on CLEC negotiations for OSS improvements. These activities grew into the development of the Master Test Plan for the Michigan Commission. I later participated in the industry collaborative for AT&T which resulted in the individual four-state MTPs used by BearingPoint and Hewlett-Packard. I also represented AT&T throughout the BearingPoint test by participating in the weekly Exception and Observation conference calls and the regularly scheduled BearingPoint meetings with

CLECs and the staffs of the State Commissions. I also participated in the meetings convened by the State Commissions to discuss testing issues on a face-to-face basis.

I. PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

15. This declaration responds to SBC's claims that it has demonstrated that its performance data are accurate, reliable and show checklist compliance, and that its performance remedy plans will assure future statutory compliance. Part II explains that the audit testing conducted to date does not validate the accuracy of SBC's performance data. Part II(A) explains that the Commission should categorically reject SBC's invitation to rely on the audits conducted by Ernst & Young ("E&Y") in the four states as proof of the accuracy and reliability of its data and ignore the findings in the ongoing BearingPoint audit.

16. SBC's selection of E&Y, its financial advisor (which is currently the subject of an SEC proceeding in which E&Y's suspension is sought), raises substantial questions regarding E&Y's independence which cannot be brushed aside lightly. Furthermore, unlike BearingPoint's Master Test Plan which was the result of a collaborative process, the development of the E&Y "audit" plan was shrouded in secrecy. Additionally, Part II(A) shows that, because of inherent defects in scope and methodology, the E&Y audits are not suitable surrogates for the far more comprehensive BearingPoint tests. Part II(A) also explains that SBC's attempt to compare the E&Y audits in this proceeding with the E&Y audit conducted in Missouri is demonstrably unsound.

17. Part II(B) explains that SBC's performance during the BearingPoint tests in the four states is substantially worse than other BOCs that have obtained 271 approval. Part

II(B) also shows that SBC's attempts to discredit the BearingPoint test are meritless. In this regard, SBC's effort to dismiss BearingPoint's findings based upon the incomplete status of that audit is patently frivolous, particularly when many of the delays in BearingPoint's testing are of SBC's own making. Equally specious is SBC's attempt to diminish BearingPoint's "Not Satisfied" findings as inconsequential, interim findings. SBC's arguments attacking BearingPoint's methodology and findings in the performance metrics tests are otherwise perplexing since SBC in the same application goes to great lengths to herald BearingPoint's methodology and findings with respect to the operational components of BearingPoint's OSS third-party tests. Given SBC's readiness to embrace the operational aspects of BearingPoint's OSS tests and its attacks on BearingPoint's performance metrics tests, it is apparent that SBC is simply attempting to escape from BearingPoint's performance measure test findings that are not to its liking.

18. Part II(B) also discusses the substantial deficiencies in SBC's performance monitoring and reporting processes that BearingPoint has uncovered. That section explains that E&Y's failure to identify these errors during its audits provides further confirmation that the E&Y audits are untrustworthy.

19. Part III explains that SBC's ever-shifting materiality standard governing restatement is, in reality, standardless. Indeed, in its initial Michigan 271 application and supplemental Michigan 271 application, SBC relied upon two different standards for determining the materiality of errors in its reported results. Incredibly, in a letter to AT&T dated July 15, 2003, SBC unveiled yet another set of untenable materiality criteria governing

restatement. Indeed, SBC's materiality standard not only changes at whim, but it also makes a mockery of the performance monitoring and reporting process which is purportedly designed to generate accurate results reflecting actual performance.

20. Part IV explains that SBC has not met its burden of proving that its billing data are accurate. Because the billing measures on which SBC relies do not accurately capture its actual performance, they cannot legitimately be relied upon as proof of SBC's performance. Furthermore, the BearingPoint audit has uncovered substantial defects in SBC's monitoring and reporting systems relating to the billing process.

21. Part V explains that SBC's claims regarding CLEC access to raw data ring hollow. That section shows that, contrary to SBC's claims, SBC, in the past, has not provided AT&T with access to its raw data within a day after the request. Furthermore, SBC still has not provided CLECs with access to the raw data underlying all performance measures.

22. Part VI explains that the performance remedy plans on which SBC relies will not deter backsliding in the wake of Section 271 relief. That section explains that, because the remedy plans on which SBC relies in Illinois, Ohio and Wisconsin are "voluntary" plans, SBC has taken the position that it can veto changes to the remedy plans with which it disagrees. Part VI explains that, in Texas, SBC has not only refused to implement changes to the remedy plan ordered by the Texas PUC, but it also recently advised AT&T that its Section 271 obligations terminate with the expiration of the interconnection agreement. To make matters worse, the interconnection agreement that SBC has proposed as an alternative to its current agreement in Texas expressly limits SBC's performance reporting obligation to eight paltry

measures. SBC's conduct in Texas is telling evidence of the inherent dangers in the voluntary remedy plans in Illinois, Ohio and Wisconsin on which SBC relies.

23. Additionally, Part VI explains that the Ohio remedy plan on which SBC relies is the original Texas remedy plan arising out of the SBC-Ameritech merger – a plan which is dated and which the Texas PUC subsequently modified because of its inherent defects. Worse yet, although this Commission has emphasized the critical importance of open proceedings in which all parties can participate in the development of performance measurements and remedy plans, the PUCO, on no fewer than three occasions, has denied the CLECs' requests for a proceeding to address the need for a permanent Ohio-specific remedy plan. The inherent defects in the Ohio remedy plan, coupled with the lack of due process, demonstrate that SBC cannot seriously contend that the Ohio remedy plan will assure future statutory compliance.

II. THE AUDIT TESTING CONDUCTED TO DATE DOES NOT VALIDATE SBC'S DATA.

24. In its application, SBC contends that this Commission can confidently rely on its commercial performance data because the accuracy and reliability of its data have been confirmed by audits conducted by E&Y in the four states. In this regard, SBC contends that the E&Y audits, "[s]tanding alone," demonstrate that its performance data are accurate.[1]

25. Alternatively, SBC contends that the E&Y audits, coupled with the completed portions of the BearingPoint PMR 1, 2 and 3 tests, demonstrate that its data are

[1] Application at 20.

trustworthy. In embellishing this assertion, SBC contends that (1) "[t]he PMR1 testing completed by BearingPoint, combined with the status of the remaining testing, should provide this Commission with the necessary assurance that SBC Midwest is collecting and storing data in a manner that supports the production of reliable published performance results for the BOC Applicants"[2]; (2) "the E&Y audit, which addressed portions of PMR1, provides additional assurance that SBC Midwest's ability to collect and store data is reliable"[3]; and (3) "[b]ecause BearingPoint's PMR4 and PMR5 metrics testing is not substantially complete, the BOC Applicants are relying on the completed E&Y audits for those areas."[4] Despite SBC's contrary assertions, on the basis of the current record, there is no sound basis upon which this Commission can properly find that SBC's performance data are accurate and reliable. In order to put these issues in context it is important to provide background information on the circumstances surrounding the retention of BearingPoint and E&Y to conduct these audits.

A. The E&Y Audit Does Not Demonstrate The Validity of SBC's Data.

1. The E&Y Audits Are Simply An End-Run Around The BearingPoint Tests.

26. SBC cannot properly rely on the E&Y audits as proof of the reliability of its data because the E&Y audits are nothing more than an improper end-run around the BearingPoint tests. In this regard, in the Spring of 2000, after collaborative discussions in which

[2] Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 93.

[3] *Id.*

[4] *Id.* ¶ 94.

the CLECs and SBC participated, the Master Test Plan ("MTP") was developed that would govern the Michigan third-party test of SBC's Operational Support Systems ("OSS"), and the Michigan Public Service Commission ("MPSC") retained BearingPoint to conduct a third-party test of SBC's OSS. Similarly, after collaborative sessions in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin in which interested CLECs and SBC participated, the parties reached agreement regarding the MTP that would govern the OSS test in these states.[5] The parties also agreed that BearingPoint would serve as the Test Manager for the tests conducted in the four states in SBC's application.[6] By or before the third quarter of 2000, the state commissions in Illinois,[7] Indiana,[8] Ohio,[9] and Wisconsin[10] had retained BearingPoint as the third-party tester of SBC's OSS.

[5] *See, e.g.*, Order on Investigation, *Illinois Commerce Commission, On Its Own Motion: Investigation concerning Illinois Bell Telephone Company's compliance with Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, No. 01-0662, dated May 13, 2003, ¶ 1199 (noting that "the MTP was developed in collaboratives that began following the Commission's Merger Order, and was first issued in March, 2000."); Order, *In the Matter of* the Petition of Indiana Bell Telephone, Incorporated, Ameritech Indiana Pursuant to I.C.8-12-61 for a Three-Phase Process for Commission Review of Various Submissions of Ameritech Indiana to Show Compliance with Section 271(c) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Cause No. 41657 (Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission), approved August 29, 2002 at 2 (noting that the master test plan for the third party OSS test will be "discussed in collaborative sessions, and then sent to the Commission for final approval"); Entry, Further Investigation into Ameritech Ohio's Entry into In-Region InterLATA Service Under Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Case No. 00-942-TP-COI at 5 (PUCO, December 7, 2000) App. C-OH, Tab 12) (establishing a collaborative to develop a master test plan that would govern BearingPoint's Ohio third-party test); Order, *Investigation into Ameritech Wisconsin's Operational Support System*, Docket No. 6720-TC-160. (PSCW March 29, 2000) (Application, App. M, Tab 32) (noting that Phase I of the PSCW's investigation would include "how OSS performance testing should proceed" and inviting parties to participate in prehearing conferences to "attempt to reach agreement" on the "substantive issues" that will be covered in Phase I).

[6] *See* Illinois MTP at 4; Indiana MTP at 4; Ohio MTP at 4; Wisconsin MTP at 4.

[7] *See* BearingPoint Illinois OSS Evaluation Project Report, December 20, 2002, at 5 (noting that "[t]he ICC Staff retained BearingPoint as the independent third-party evaluator"); Contract between the Illinois Commerce Commission and KPMG (now doing business as BearingPoint), dated May 23, 2002 which is posted on the BearingPoint website.

27. The BearingPoint MTP in each of these four states covers three tests: (1) Performance Metrics Reviews ("PMR"); (2) Processes and Procedures Reviews ("PPR"); and (3) Transaction Verification and Validation ("TVV"). The PMR test, which is discussed herein, is designed to assess "the systems, processes, and other operational elements associated with Ameritech's support for Performance Metrics." The PMR portion of the OSS test assesses five areas: (1) PMR1 - Data Collection and Storage Verification and Validation Review; (2) PMR2 - Metrics Definitions and Standards Development and Documentation Verification and Validation Review; (3) PMR3 - Metrics Change Management Verification and Validation Review; (4) PMR4 - Metrics Data Integrity Verification and Validation Review; and (5) PMR5 - Metrics Calculation and Reporting Verification and Validation Review. In response to an MTP Change Request submitted by AT&T and approved by each of the State Commissions in early 2002, PMR3B tests (Performance Measurement Restatement and Remedy Recalculation Validation Review) were implemented.

(footnote continued from previous page)

[8] BearingPoint Indiana Interim OSS and Performance Measurement Status Report, dated February 28, 2003 at 5 (noting that "[o]n August 29, 2000, at the request of the parties, including Ameritech, the IURC approved BearingPoint to serve as the OSS test administrator for the Ameritech Indiana OSS Evaluation") (footnote omitted).

[9] BearingPoint Ohio Interim OSS Status Report at 5 (noting that the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio "ordered a comprehensive test of SBC Ameritech's OSS," and that "the Ohio Specific industry collaborative reached consensus on June 1, 2000 to hire KPMG Consulting as an independent third-party evaluator to design a Master Test Plan (MTP) and conduct the test") (footnote omitted).

[10] BearingPoint Wisconsin OSS Evaluation Project Interim Report at 5 (noting that, on May 3, 2000, the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin ordered SBC "to contract with the Commission's choice of a third-party tester, KPMG Consulting LLC (KPMG)") (footnote omitted).

28. During its testing, BearingPoint initially undertook an evaluation of SBC's reported data for April 2001; however, BearingPoint was thwarted in its efforts because of the substantial inadequacies in SBC's performance measurement system practices, procedures and documentation which were the subject of a number of exceptions. At SBC's urging, BearingPoint next targeted SBC's October 2001 performance results for testing. However, SBC's data generated during that period also failed to meet the requirements of soundness and thoroughness of data management practices and standards that were established as criteria in the Master Test Plan. SBC then selected the January, February and March 2002 period as the evaluation period for testing by BearingPoint. Not surprisingly, because of the substantial difficulties that BearingPoint encountered in attempting to replicate SBC's data covering that period, BearingPoint was forced to abandon this approach and target SBC's July and August 2002 data months for examination.[11] For Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin, the data months that were last targeted for replication testing were July, August, and September 2002. Notably, this was BearingPoint's *fourth* attempt to evaluate the reliability of SBC's performance data.

29. While BearingPoint's performance metrics audit was underway – the progress of which had been slowed significantly because of SBC's own conduct[12] – SBC notified the Michigan Public Service Commission that it had unilaterally retained E&Y to

[11] *See*, *e.g., Order on Investigation Concerning Illinois Bell Telephone Company's Compliance with Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, No. 01-0662 (ICC May 13, 2003), ¶ 2763 (Application, App. C-IL, Tab 135).

[12] *See* Report of the Michigan Public Service Commission, Case No. U-12320 ("Michigan Report") at 16 (noting that "early in the testing process the Commission observed obstinance on the part of SBC in addressing the inadequacies which BearingPoint identified").

conduct two attestation examinations that purportedly evaluated the accuracy and completeness of SBC's Michigan performance data, as well as SBC's system of controls used to calculate performance results generated during that same period.[13] As SBC points out, "[s]hortly after the release of the first E&Y audits in Michigan, each of the BOC Applicants retained E&Y to perform a substantially identical performance measurement audit for its respective performance measurements."[14]

30. The circumstances surrounding SBC's retention of E&Y to conduct a separate audit in Michigan, as well as the four states in SBC's application, show that SBC was merely attempting to escape from the overwhelming weight of negative findings in the ongoing BearingPoint test and its professed commitment to complete testing as a condition of state-level 271 checklist review. In that connection, in its submission before the MPSC, SBC stated that it had engaged E&Y to conduct a "separate, independent" assessment of the accuracy and reliability of its performance measurement reporting systems and processes to "supplement the record on this issue."[15] SBC asserted that it had engaged E&Y because it did not expect BearingPoint to complete its work for the Metrics Data Integrity (PMR4) and Metrics Calculations and Reporting (PMR5) portions of the Performance Metrics Audit Test by the time

[13] Ehr Aff. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I*) ¶ 198.

[14] *See* Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 18; McKenzie (Ohio) Aff. ¶ 56 (noting that on January 13, 2003, SBC submitted to the PUCO two E&Y audit reports that examined Ohio Bell's compliance with the PUCO's approved performance measurements business rules, and Ohio Bell's performance measurement reporting systems and controls"); Butler (Indiana) Aff. ¶ 71 (noting that SBC filed before the IURC E&Y audit reports).

[15] SBC Ameritech Michigan Notice of Intent to Supplement the Record, Case No. U-12320 (MPSC) at 1, July 30, 2002.

it planned to submit its performance results to the MPSC. *Timing*, as SBC acknowledged, was the *sole* reason for retaining E&Y. Ironically, however, many of the delays in the audit process were attributable to SBC. For example, Attachment 1, which refers to three of the 50 currently unresolved observations in the PMR5 tests, is highlighted to show the extent to which SBC delayed BearingPoint's testing by seeking repeated deferrals of discussions regarding these observations. Each of the highlighted entries reflects at least one, and in other instances, two- to three-week deferrals at SBC's request. As Attachment 1 shows, SBC deferred discussion of: Observation 627 on 19 separate occasions for a total of 26 weeks; Observation 639 on 18 occasions for a period of 16 weeks; and Observation 664 on 20 occasions for a period exceeding 31 weeks. These types of delays necessarily affect the progress of BearingPoint's testing.

31. At bottom, SBC's retention of E&Y was nothing more than a thinly disguised attempt to do an end-run around the BearingPoint test. Indeed, it is ironic that SBC resorted to the E&Y audit: it was SBC that proposed that the third-party test should be modeled on the New York PSC military style test; it was SBC that proposed the hiring of BearingPoint to oversee the tests in Michigan and the other four states; it was SBC that proposed the performance measurements that were being used by BearingPoint in the OSS test; and it was SBC that supported the adoption of the BearingPoint Master Test Plan. The only things that had changed were that BearingPoint's testing had proceeded slowly because of SBC's own delays and SBC's own performance monitoring and reporting systems had been exposed as inaccurate and unreliable. Thus, SBC's request to "supplement" the record with the E&Y audit in Michigan, as well as the four states included in SBC's application, was nothing more than a

transparent attempt to escape from BearingPoint's negative findings and to avoid taking the required corrective action to fix its OSS and performance measurement systems.

2. The Selection Of E&Y As An Auditor And The Development Of The E&Y Master Test Plan Confirm That The E&Y Audits Are Untrustworthy.

32. The very selection of E&Y and the circumstances surrounding the development of E&Y's scope of work (*i.e.* E&Y's own Master Test Plan) show that the E&Y audits must be eyed with suspicion. SBC's retention of E&Y raises serious concerns regarding E&Y's "independence." BearingPoint was selected in an open, consensual process. In contrast, SBC hired E&Y unilaterally, and other parties to the proceeding were simply advised of E&Y's selection and the scope of E&Y's work only *after* much of E&Y's work was completed. No CLECs were involved in determinations regarding the scope of E&Y's work; rather, CLECs – and in some cases the state commissions – were simply advised after the fact regarding the work that SBC assigned to E&Y.

33. Notably, E&Y also serves as SBC's financial auditor. In commenting on the selection of E&Y to conduct the Section 272(d)(2) biennial audit of SBC's operations in Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas, the Public Utility Commission of Texas expressed its own "concerns" about the selection of E&Y, stating:

> The Texas PUC has some concerns about the "independence" or neutrality of the auditor selected. Ernst & Young, the auditor selected, is the financial auditor for SBC. Though this audit was performed by individuals who are not part of the

> SBC financial audit group, the question of true independence, in the sense of neutrality and lack of bias, arises.[16]

34. Critically, the fact that the Securities Exchange Commission "[i]n a rare move" is now "seeking to have Ernst & Young suspended from accepting new corporate clients for six months because of the big accounting firm's alleged failure to remain completely independent from companies whose books it audits"[17] serves as additional evidence that AT&T's concerns about E&Y's objectivity are plainly warranted.

35. Additionally, the BearingPoint Master Test Plan was the result of an open, collaborative process in which the CLEC industry provided suggestions regarding the parameters for testing, many of which were incorporated in the Master Test Plan. Furthermore, BearingPoint's Project Plan summaries and performance metrics updates for each state are available to the public on its website. In stark contrast, to the extent that E&Y had a Master Test Plan, it was cloaked in secrecy. Similarly, E&Y's reports are invariably provided in a piecemeal and disparate fashion, and its underlying documentation has never been made available to the public.

36. Notably, although the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio ("PUCO") has approved SBC's request to provide in-region, interLATA services in Ohio, it rejected SBC's

[16] Comments of the Public Utility Commission of Texas, *In the Matter of Accounting Safeguards Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996: Section 272(d) Biennial Audit Procedure*, CC Docket No. 96-150, dated January 30, 2003 at 6.

[17] Dow Jones Newswires, "SEC Wants Ernst & Young Suspended From New Cos. for 6 Mos.," May 30, 2003, attached as Attachment A to the Moore/Connolly Decl. (*Michigan 217 Proceeding II*).

assertion "that the E&Y audit provides increased assurance in regard to the integrity, reliability, and accuracy of [SBC's] commercial data . . . ."[18] In buttressing this conclusion, the PUCO noted its concern that the State was not involved in the retention of E&Y or the development and administration of the E&Y audit:

> The PUCO believes that the E&Y audit is not a substitute for BearingPoint's PMR1, PMR4, and PMR5 modules of the PMR test domain. The E&Y testing approach for data integrity, reliability, and accuracy does not include the stringent requirements of the PMR test criteria per the Ohio MTP. A review of SBC Ohio's highly complex source code (E&Y's approach), for example, is not equivalent to BearingPoint's approach of independently developing its own source code. *Additionally, neither the PUCO nor its staff were involved in the selection of E&Y, the development of the scope of the E&Y audit, or in the administration of the E&Y audit.*[19]

37. In extolling the results of the operational aspects of BearingPoint's third-party test of SBC's OSS, SBC emphasizes that "BearingPoint conducted each of the four tests under the daily supervision of the state commissions and their staffs," and that "[t]hese are the same protective measures the Commission has found adequate in prior 271 orders."[20] In stark contrast, the E&Y audit was not conducted under the auspices of the state commissions. Indeed, the E&Y audit was commissioned by SBC. Thus, by SBC's own admission, the E&Y audit

[18] PUCO Report and Evaluation for SBC Ohio's Entry into In-Region InterLATA Service Under Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, June 26, 2003, App. A, p. 28.

[19] *Id.,* p. 27 (emphasis added).

[20] Application at 58. As noted herein, BearingPoint's third-party tests of SBC's OSS consist of the Transaction Verification and Validation and Processes and Procedures Review (together referred to as the operational aspects of the test) and the performance metrics review.

could not have "the same protective measures the Commission has found adequate in prior 271 orders."[21]

3. The E&Y Audit Procedures Are Seriously Flawed.

38. SBC's request that this Commission evaluate the reliability of its performance data based upon the E&Y audits alone should be viewed for what it is – a transparent effort to jettison the far more rigorous and comprehensive State-commissioned BearingPoint audits that have uncovered and continue to uncover significant defects in SBC's performance monitoring and reporting processes. E&Y's audits (as well as subsequent work to verify the corrective measures SBC has taken) cannot legitimately be relied upon as proof of the accuracy of SBC's data because E&Y's audits suffer from substantial defects in scope and methodology.

39. In this regard, during the course of its engagements in each state, E&Y issued a series of reports, including: (1) Report of Independent Accountants which assessed SBC's compliance with the business rules governing the metrics ("Compliance Report");[22] (2) Report of Independent Accountants which assessed the effectiveness of SBC's controls

[21] *Id.*

[22] E&Y Indiana Compliance Report, dated February 13, 2003; E&Y Illinois Compliance Report, dated January 17, 2003; E&Y Ohio Compliance Report, dated January 13, 2003; E&Y Wisconsin Compliance Report, dated February 13, 2003.

("Controls Report");[23] (3) Supplemental Report which refers to E&Y's testing methodology;[24] and (4) Final Corrective Action Report.[25]

40. It is indisputable that there are differences to the scope and methodologies in the E&Y and BearingPoint audits.[26] In this regard, SBC contends that "[t]here is a high correlation in results rendered by E&Y and BearingPoint," and that any differences between the audits are attributable to two factors – timing and materiality.[27] In buttressing its first argument, SBC contends that "[b]ecause BearingPoint tests the PM data for a particular set of months, the more recent corrective actions that Michigan Bell has made in response to issues raised by E&Y in some instances are not reflected in the older data that BearingPoint reviewed."[28] Second, SBC asserts that other differences between the E&Y and BearingPoint test findings are due to the different "materiality" standards that both auditors used.[29]

41. SBC's first argument is demonstrably unsound because, *inter alia,* SBC's application, on its face, shows that E&Y's audits did not identify or address any number of

[23] E&Y Indiana Controls Report, dated February 13, 2003; E&Y Illinois Controls Report, dated January 17, 2003; E&Y Ohio Controls Report, dated January 13, 2003; and E&Y Wisconsin Controls Report, dated February 13, 2003.

[24] E&Y Indiana Supplemental Report, dated February 13, 2003; E&Y Illinois Supplemental Report, dated January 17, 2003; E&Y Ohio Supplemental Report, dated January 13, 2003; and E&Y Wisconsin Supplemental Report, dated February 13, 2003.

[25] *See* Ehr/Fioretti Aff., Attachments A-1, A-2, A-3, and A-4.

[26] Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶¶ 95-96; *see also* Application at 22.

[27] Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 96; *see also* Application at 22.

[28] Application at 22.

[29] Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 96.

defects that BearingPoint has uncovered during the course of its PMR tests. These gaping holes in E&Y's analyses (which are discussed more fully herein) highlight the absurdity of SBC's argument that E&Y has already identified and addressed the data defects that BearingPoint has found. Indeed, in those instances where E&Y failed even to detect the data problems that BearingPoint identified, E&Y clearly has not tested and could not have tested the corrective actions that SBC heralds in its application. Furthermore, as discussed in more detail below, because E&Y's testing procedures were limited and flawed, E&Y's audits provide no assurance that SBC's purported corrective actions have resolved the data defects that E&Y did, in fact, identify during the course of its audits. Moreover, because BearingPoint's testing is incomplete and BearingPoint has not yet determined whether SBC's purported corrective actions are effective, SBC's partisan claims regarding the efficacy of its corrective actions are premature, unsupported assertions which should be accorded no weight.

42. With respect to SBC's second argument, SBC correctly points out that BearingPoint's test did not employ the materiality standard that E&Y used during its audit. In that connection, during its audits E&Y determined that an error would be considered material if it would change the original reported result by five percent or more, or if the error, when corrected, would cause the original attainment/failure result to reverse. E&Y applied this materiality standard at the sub-measure level.

43. In contrast, during its audit, BearingPoint identifies all discrepancies in reported values. However, despite SBC's contrary assertions, the BearingPoint performance

metrics tests do not require "perfection."[30] Although BearingPoint identifies all discrepancies in reported values, in determining whether SBC has satisfied the test criteria for performance measurement groups in the PMR4 and PMR5 tests, BearingPoint uses a 95% benchmark standard.[31] As demonstrated in more detail below, the mere fact that other BOCs in Section 271 proceedings have satisfied between 96 and 100 percent of similar or more stringent BearingPoint test criteria belies SBC's assertions that the test criteria are too exacting.

44. Furthermore, as explained in more detail below, because the temporal scope of E&Y's audits was confined to an examination of SBC's March-May 2002 results, BearingPoint has uncovered defects in SBC's data that were generated outside the period covered in E&Y's review – defects that would have constituted material errors even under E&Y's materiality standard.

45. In any event, SBC was largely responsible for BearingPoint's retention and agreed to this testing in each state in 2000. SBC participated in the development of the BearingPoint Master Test Plans and could have sought revisions to any of the plans if it believed

[30] *See id.* ¶ 95 n.50.

[31] *See, e.g.*, BearingPoint Ohio OSS Evaluation Project Report Performance Metrics Update, June 30, 2003 ("BearingPoint Ohio June 30 Metrics Update") (noting that, for the PMR 4 test, BearingPoint "is using the benchmark that 95 percent of required source records are included for each measure set valuated in the measure group" and that "no more than 5 percent of processed records do not correspond to actual BearingPoint Test CLEC transaction records for each measure set evaluated in the measure group, and that for the PMR 5 test, "BearingPoint is using the benchmark that for 95 percent of required values, SBC Ameritech's reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree for three consecutive data months"). BearingPoint Ohio June 30 Metrics Update at 81, 148.

the requirements were too onerous.[32] Because SBC agreed to the test methodology, approach, and evaluation criteria, it should be estopped from asserting that BearingPoint's testing standards are too exacting.

46. Relatedly, as even the PUCO has conceded, because of the profound differences between the procedures and methodologies in the E&Y and BearingPoint tests, the E&Y audits cannot serve as an appropriate substitute for BearingPoint's more rigorous and comprehensive testing. Indeed, as the PUCO found, "[t]he E&Y testing approach for data integrity, reliability and accuracy does not include the stringent requirements of the PMR test criteria per the Ohio MTP."[33] Some examples of the differences in E&Y's and BearingPoint's test methodologies follow:

47. *Temporal Scope*. The temporal limitations of the E&Y audit highlight the fundamental infirmities in SBC's decision to rely on the E&Y audit as proof of the reliability of its data. BearingPoint's audits involve an examination of BearingPoint's January, May, July, August, September, December 2002 and February 2003 data.[34] In contrast, E&Y's audit was

[32] When it has otherwise suited its purposes, SBC has sought changes to the Master Test Plan. As SBC concedes, it sought and obtained approval from the Illinois commission to direct BearingPoint during testing to "incorporate 'documentation only' clarification to the performance measure business rules" as reflected in Version 1.9. Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 38 n. 15.

[33] *See* PUCO Report and Evaluation for SBC Ohio's Entry into In-Region InterLATA Service Under Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, June 29, 2003, App. A at 27.

[34] *See, e.g.* BearingPoint Ohio June 30, 2003 Metrics Update at 59 (noting that BearingPoint is examining SBC's January, May, July, August, and December 2002 and February 2003 performance results).

strictly limited to an examination of data generated in March, April and May 2002.[35] E&Y's audits did not identify and address errors regarding data that were generated outside the period of its examination – including errors that presumably would have satisfied E&Y's standard of materiality. Relatedly, in its report on SBC's controls, E&Y cautioned that its findings were strictly limited to the point in time of its assessment, and that "projections of any evaluation of controls . . . to future periods are subject to the risk that controls may become inadequate because of changes in condition, or that the degree of compliance with the policies or procedures may deteriorate."[36]

48. Furthermore, E&Y's opinions are based upon source systems that have since undergone major changes. Indeed, after E&Y conducted its testing, SBC implemented significant system changes, including using ICS/DSS as its system of record for EDI/LSOG 5-based transaction data. As a consequence, the E&Y audit did not examine and could not have examined the effect that these major system changes have had on SBC's performance monitoring and reporting processes. As E&Y has testified, its audits did not assess the impact of system changes occurring outside the period covered by E&Y's review:

> MR. CONNOLLY: So if they've got some new procedure that was brought in, let's say in July, and has an effect from July forward, that's not part of your analysis at all?
>
> MR. HORST: Well, we would look at it to determine if it impacted March, April and May. Obviously if it would have

[35] *See, e.g.* E&Y Indiana Compliance Report dated February 13, 2003, attaching Report of Management on Compliance with the Indiana Performance Measurement Business Rules and Corrective Action Implemented, dated February 13, 2003 (noting that the Evaluation Period is March, April and May 2002.)

[36] Illinois E&Y Report of Independent Accountants on the Controls Examination, January 17, 2003 at 1.

> changed March, April or May had it been implemented back in those months instead of just prospectively, we'll take a look at that. But if it's something that we have in our report and it just made us restate it, let's say June, July forward, no.[37]

49. *Raw Data*. Verification of the accuracy of reported results requires a comprehensive evaluation of all elements in the data collection, monitoring and reporting processing streams. That examination necessarily involves an assessment of the accuracy of the raw input data, as well as an assessment of a BOC's obligation to apply correctly the calculations, formulas, and exclusions in business rules governing the measures when calculating performance results. The E&Y audit is deficient because E&Y did not conduct a comprehensive examination of SBC's raw data to assess the accuracy of SBC's reported results. Indeed, in the *Michigan 271 Proceeding*, E&Y stated that:

> Data Integrity. E&Y examined underlying raw data. E&Y's approach to the data integrity portion of the examination included all key areas, including review of raw data. The procedures employed included understanding and testing the sources of data, the processing and control of such data, and the validity of data entering the source systems. E&Y performed examination procedures in many different areas impacting data integrity, including both manual and electronic original data sources entering the source systems for processing and ultimately, inclusion in the calculation of performance measures.[38]

50. However, a close examination of the testing that E&Y conducted reveals that E&Y's examinations did not include testing of the raw data through SBC's systems to

[37] *See* Hearing Transcript, Volume 39, Case No. U-12320 (MPSC), October 14, 2002 at 4696, attached as Attach. C to the Moore/Connolly Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I)*. *See also* Tr. 4724-25, 4743, 4755 (no examination of new or changed controls or future compliance), attached as Attach. C to the Moore/Connolly Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I)*. E&Y's approach contrasts sharply with the requirements of the Master Test Plan, which requires a test until you pass, or military-style methodology.

[38] Dolan/Horst Second Joint Aff. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I)*, at ¶ 19.

assure the accuracy and reliability of SBC's reported data. E&Y's testing involved site visits so that the E&Y testers could observe the preparation of "raw data" in the SBC work centers. This testing involved an examination of procedures that SBC staff utilize in the course of order processing, provisioning, and maintenance and repair functions. E&Y observed SBC staff entering orders, provisioning services, working with trouble tickets, and validating wholesale bills. These test steps gave E&Y insight into the creation of "transactions" and the entries within transactions that would be used for reporting results.

51. E&Y's testing did *not* include a robust evaluation of the raw data used in performance measurement reporting or the manner in which filtered processed data (derived from raw data) are used for performance measurement reporting. During its tests, E&Y did not follow the paths of the raw data through SBC's systems to ensure the reliability of SBC's reported results. In addition, E&Y did not generate its own transactions that could have been used as a control point for pre-ordering, ordering, provisioning, repair, and billing testing. During its testing, E&Y relied on samples of data obtained from production data files.[39] E&Y did not trace the samples back to the source systems from which they emanated to verify that the data elements needed for reporting were the same as or consistent with the original raw data.

52. Furthermore, during its data integrity testing, E&Y examined SBC's data after they had been translated from the CLEC interface format, Electronic Data Interchange (EDI), into the SBC internal system "language," by the SBC translation system:

[39] E&Y used samples of 260 transactions for large data sets and 40 transactions for small data groups. In some cases, E&Y indicated it employed 100% samples for small groups.

> MR. KEVIN GRAY: The EDI translator program is really a pass through. It receives – and again it's only for certain interfaces. So as a transaction is received it goes through the EDI translator and then into the source system.
>
> Q. So if there was a transaction that got into that translator, but got eaten, you wouldn't have seen that, correct?
>
> MR. KEVIN GRAY: There are – in our transaction testing?
>
> Q. Yes.
>
> MR. KEVIN GRAY: No, we wouldn't see it.[40]

53. SBC's failure to examine the raw data before they were processed in the EDI translator is a serious defect in testing. As a result, E&Y's audit would not detect the "lost order" problem experienced by CLECs in New York shortly after Bell Atlantic-New York ("Bell Atlantic") won 271 authorization there.[41] In that connection, Bell Atlantic reported that a major contributor to that problem was Bell Atlantic's ECXpert system. ECXpert is a system that Bell Atlantic installed to decrypt orders that CLECs submit via Bell Atlantic's EDI interface and translate them into Bell Atlantic's internal Electronic Interface Format before the files are handed off to Bell Atlantic's DCAS System for business rules tests. However, because E&Y reviewed SBC's data only after it passed through the EDI translator, E&Y could not have

[40] Illinois Hearing Transcript at 3429, *In the Matter of: Illinois Commerce Commission, On its Own Motion, Investigation Concerning Illinois Bell Telephone Company's Compliance with Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Docket No. 01-0662.

[41] *See In the Matter of Bell Atlantic-New York Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Service in the State of New York*, File No. EB-00-IH0085, Order released March 9, 2000.

detected whether transactions had been lost (as in New York) before they were handed off to the OSS component that becomes the source system for reporting ordering performance.

54. In contrast, during its tests, BearingPoint examines and compares SBC's raw data (*i.e.* unprocessed data) against SBC's processed data and tracks SBC's raw data through SBC's systems with comprehensive (and documented) controls to assure the accuracy and reliability of reported results.[42] During the PMR4 data integrity tests, BearingPoint draws high volume samples from the reporting systems that must be supported by corresponding raw data transactions. BearingPoint also uses test CLEC transactions which serve as the control method and basis for testing the accuracy of SBC's data used in processing CLEC transactions and reporting performance results.[43] BearingPoint's four PMR4 data integrity test criteria rely on test data sets, specified by BearingPoint, that must be traced to the data captured at the source system for each of the 18 Performance Measure Groups:

> PMR4-1 Required source records are included in data used to calculate measures in each Measure Group.
>
> PMR4-2 Inappropriate records are not present in processed data used to calculate measures in each Measure Group.
>
> PMR4-3 Records in processed data used to calculate measures in each Measure Group are consistent with unprocessed data from source systems.

[42] *See, e.g.,* BearingPoint Illinois Performance Metrics Report dated December 20, 2002 at 30 (noting that "BearingPoint extracted and analyzed the fields in the unprocessed data files" and "BearingPoint examined each unprocessed log, file, and record separately").

[43] *Id.* (noting that "BearingPoint also compared its own records of BearingPoint test CLEC transactions (*e.g.*, number of records submitted, confirmation time received, etc.) to SBC Ameritech's processed data").

> PMR4-4 Data fields in processed data used to calculate measures in each Measure Group are consistent with unprocessed data from source systems.

55. Those performance measurements with reporting system data which cannot be traced to the corresponding data captured at the source systems are documented in observations issued by BearingPoint because data integrity is not assured. Through this testing, BearingPoint has found numerous instances where the integrity of SBC's data was deemed suspect. BearingPoint has issued 13 Exceptions and 25 Observations which address data integrity issues in the four states affecting 83 performance measures. A number of these observations were issued *after* E&Y's Compliance Reports were published.[44] Based upon the foregoing, SBC cannot reasonably assert that E&Y's audits involved a comprehensive evaluation of SBC's raw data through SBC's systems to assure accuracy in reported results.

56. *Analytical Review***.** During its audits, E&Y claims that it undertook analyses of "volumes, fluctuations in results and reasons for parity or out-of-parity results for the period under examination."[45] However, E&Y's "analytical reviews" were woefully inadequate because they involved only CLEC aggregate, affiliate and retail analog data associated with the published results. E&Y did not examine CLEC-specific results, including test CLEC results from BearingPoint's transaction testing. Moreover, E&Y discussed these issues with SBC, reviewed SBC's explanations and excuses for poor results, and then determined if the

[44] *See* Attach. 2 which includes some examples of observations that BearingPoint issued after E&Y's Compliance Reports were published.

[45] Dolan/Horst Aff. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I*), Attachment D at 6. *See also* Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 25 (noting that E&Y conducted an "analytical review of monthly fluctuations in reported results.")

explanation was "reasonable." No additional testing or corrective measures were required, and E&Y did not consult with any third parties for input on the "reasonableness" of SBC's explanations.

57. AT&T has reviewed E&Y's "workpapers" developed in its review of SBC's compliance with the business rules. Those workpapers contained records of the "analytical reviews" that it describes in its Supplemental Report:[46]

> For each PM reviewed, as identified in Appendix A, E&Y conducted an analytical review to evaluate the reasonableness of reported results. This review analyzed transaction volumes, fluctuations in results, and reasons for parity or out-of-parity results for the period under examination. The procedures performed for PM recalculation testing covered Master Test Plan Sections: PMR 4 and 5.

58. E&Y's analysis, as documented, consisted of questions raised by E&Y that were the subject of discussions with SBC alone. The responses were not verified by E&Y. Indeed, SBC's responses were accepted at face value. At no time, did E&Y reject an SBC response or ask further questions of SBC or of any other party.

59. *Performance Measurement Program Code***.** E&Y's purported performance measurement code reviews are equally infirm. During its testing, BearingPoint programs the state commission-approved business rules into its computer programs that are internal to PMR5 (replication) testing and develops its own source.[47] In stark contrast, during its

[46] *See, e.g.,* BearingPoint Illinois Supplemental Report, dated January 17, 2003 at 9.

[47] *See* Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 115 (noting that BearingPoint independently replicates SBC's reported data by "using calculation programs that BearingPoint developed to recalculate SBC Midwest's unfiltered, unprocessed data.")

audits E&Y staff read the programmed instructions within SBC's software systems to determine whether they complied with the business rules and participated in "walk-through" meetings where SBC staff described the step-by-step logic used in the computer programs. Indeed, unlike BearingPoint, E&Y did not develop its own complementary programming logic and process the same transaction files used by SBC for calculating and posting the measures. Code review (supplemented with "walk-throughs") -- the approach taken by E&Y -- is wholly ineffective in testing the implementation of complex programming requirements. Indeed, in finding that the E&Y audit is not an appropriate surrogate for the BearingPoint test, the PUCO found that "[a] review of SBC Ohio's highly complex source code (E&Y's approach) . . . is not equivalent to BearingPoint's approach of independently developing its own source code."[48]

60. *Interpretations of Business Rules*. E&Y also accepted without challenge SBC's interpretations of the business rules. In this regard, in its Compliance Reports, E&Y rendered the following qualified opinion regarding SBC's compliance with the business rules governing the metrics:

> In our opinion, considering the Company's interpretations of the Business Rules described in Attachment B [of the E&Y Report] and except for the material noncompliance described in Attachment A [of the E&Y Report], the Company complies, in all material respects with the Business Rules during the Evaluation Period.[49]

[48] PUCO Report and Evaluation for SBC Ohio's Entry into In-Region InterLATA Services Under Section 271 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, June 26, 2003, Appendix A at 27.

[49] *See, e.g.*, E&Y Illinois Compliance Report attaching Attachment B of the Report of Management.

61. Attachment B to the E&Y Compliance Reports identified 49 "interpretations made by management" in implementing the business rules governing the measures. However, E&Y accepted without critique or analysis SBC's "interpretations."[50] In contrast, BearingPoint, consistent with its approach in other states where BOCs have obtained 271 approval, tested SBC's actual compliance with the business rules governing each metric. Interpretations that are inconsistent with BearingPoint's evaluation of the business rules result in the issuance of observations.

62. *Regression Testing.* During its audits, BearingPoint performs regression testing to assess whether the corrective action that SBC has taken to resolve a data problem has had other, unintended consequences. Because BearingPoint has performed regression testing on a continual basis, it has uncovered numerous instances where a performance measure failed the replication test because of a reason other than that originally identified by BearingPoint – a failure that could indicate that SBC's remedial steps had unintended consequences. Moreover, BearingPoint identifies through subsequent "versions" of its exceptions and observations, those occasions on which SBC's purported remedial steps fail to resolve the original data problem that BearingPoint identified. Importantly, the Commission staff, noting that "E&Y examined modified computer code and in some cases reflowed a subset of data … through the revised logic to test the correction," pointedly asked SBC in the *Michigan 271 Proceeding* how E&Y could have assessed "whether the correction, as implemented, had unintended consequences with

[50] *See, e.g.* Ehr Aff. ¶ 221 (noting that E&Y "did not express a negative opinion" regarding the 49 "interpretations made by management").

respect to other data that was not mishandled by the original code."[51] SBC conceded that "E&Y did not perform 'regression testing' in order to analyze whether the corrective action had unintended consequences with respect to other data that was not affected by the original problem . . . ."[52]

63. *Data Collection, Retention and Storage*. As discussed in more detail below, BearingPoint's audits include an evaluation of SBC's data collection, retention and storage practices. As a result of this testing, BearingPoint has found that SBC has failed to retain data in compliance with state regulatory requirements. However, the E&Y audits did not detect and could not have detected these problems because E&Y conducted no testing in this area.

64. *Technical Documentation*. As discussed in more detail below, the PMR1 test in each of the Master Test Plans includes an evaluation of SBC's technical performance measurement documentation to assess the completeness and accuracy of the underlying step-by-step calculation logic that is used to calculate reported results. During the PMR1 test BearingPoint has found that the step-by-step calculation logic in SBC's technical documentation is incomplete or accurate. However, E&Y did not undertake this review during its audits.

65. Additionally, as explained in more detail below, the BearingPoint PMR1 test is designed to assess the accuracy and completeness of SBC's data flow diagrams ("DFDs")

[51] *Ex Parte* Letter from Geoffrey M. Klineberg to Marlene H. Dortch, dated March 17, 2003 (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I*), Attach. A at 1.

[52] *Ex Parte* Letter from Geoffrey M. Klineberg to Marlene H. Dortch, dated March 28, 2003 (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I*), Attach. A at 4, n. 11.

(which document the data flows from source system to the performance reporting system) and data element maps ("DEMs") (which document data transformations from source system to the performance measurement reporting system at the field level.) SBC's DFDs and DEMs are blueprints that SBC analysts and programmers use to manage the systems and data underlying SBC's performance results. BearingPoint has found that SBC's DFDs and DEMs are inaccurate or incomplete for numerous performance metrics. However, E&Y's audits did not uncover and could not have uncovered these gaps and errors in SBC's technical documentation because E&Y did not conduct such a review during its audits.

66. *Blind Replication.* BearingPoint's audit methodology, embodied in the MTPs, includes a comprehensive examination of SBC's performance monitoring and reporting processes. During its audits, BearingPoint, using the published business rules governing each of the metrics, attempts to "replicate" SBC's reported monthly results to assess the accuracy of SBC's performance monitoring and reporting processes. In contrast, E&Y's compliance testing is designed solely to assess the extent to which SBC complies with the business rules. As SBC has conceded, "[b]ecause E&Y did not include blind replication as part of the BOC applicants' performance measurements, there is no way to compare BearingPoint's current results on PMR5-2 (Replication) with E&Y's findings."[53] During its compliance testing, E&Y merely evaluated whether SBC correctly calculated the numerator and denominator of the performance measures.

67. *Controls Examination*. BearingPoint conducts military-style testing to determine whether SBC's performance measurement data processing procedures include

adequate controls to assure accuracy in reported results. As discussed more fully below, BearingPoint is continuing to test SBC's data collection and reporting systems to assess whether controls are in place to assure the accuracy of SBC's reported data.

68. In its Controls Examination, E&Y initially found that SBC's processes used to generate performance data did not include sufficient controls to assure accurate reported data. In its application, SBC insists that E&Y has validated that SBC has taken the corrective action necessary to correct the control deficiencies that E&Y identified. However, given the inherent defects in E&Y's testing procedures, no solace can or should be taken that SBC's purported corrective action has actually fixed these problems.

69. Given the stark differences between the E&Y and BearingPoint tests and the flawed methodologies in the E&Y audit, the issue before this Commission is whether the E&Y audits are a suitable substitute for the more rigorous and comprehensive BearingPoint tests in assessing the accuracy and reliability of SBC's data. The answer is inescapably clear: the inherent limitations and deficiencies in the E&Y audits preclude a finding that the E&Y audits demonstrate that SBC's data are accurate and trustworthy.

4. SBC's Attempt To Compare E&Y's Audits To The Missouri Audit Fails.

70. SBC contends that, because E&Y's audits in this proceeding are "substantially more comprehensive than the audit it conducted on behalf of the Missouri Public

---

(footnote continued from previous page)
[53] Application at 26.

Service Commission in 2000 as part of that commission's review of Southwestern Bell's section 271 application in Missouri," the E&Y audits, "standing alone . . . should be more than adequate to satisfy this Commission's interest in having a third-party test of the BOC applicants' performance measurement-processes and results."[54] SBC's analysis is wide of the mark.

71. The *Missouri 271 Proceeding* and this proceeding are clearly distinguishable. In the *Missouri 271 Proceeding*, the E&Y audit was not contradicted by another performance metrics audit that was being conducted simultaneously under the direction of the Missouri Public Service Commission that uncovered substantial deficiencies in the performance data. In stark contrast, the BearingPoint audits are being conducted under the auspices of the State commissions. Moreover, as discussed in more detail below, BearingPoint's audits have uncovered and continue to uncover substantial defects in SBC's performance collection and reporting systems which demonstrate the inherent unreliability of the performance data on which SBC relies.

B. The BearingPoint Tests Show That SBC Has Not Demonstrated The Accuracy Of Its Data.

1. SBC's Performance During The BearingPoint Tests Is Far Worse Than Other BOC Applicants.

72. The State-approved BearingPoint tests conducted in all four states are far from complete. However, the test results reveal that SBC has passed only 48 to 57% of the applicable test criteria in the four states.

[54] *Id.* at 20.

73. As Table 1 shows, SBC has passed 57% and failed 25% of the applicable test criteria in Illinois.[55] The remaining 18% of test criteria are indeterminate. Thus, SBC has not yet passed 43% of the test criteria in the Illinois BearingPoint test.

Table 1 - Illinois

Score	PMR1	PMR2	PMR3	PMR3B	PMR4	PMR5	**Total**
Satisfied	80	3	15	14	13	30	**155**
Not Satisfied	27	0	0	0	3	37	**67**
Indeterminate	19	0	0	0	24	5	**48**
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	32	0	**32**

74. As Table 2 shows, SBC has passed 48% and failed 24% of the applicable test criteria of the BearingPoint test in Indiana.[56] The remaining 28% of the test criteria are indeterminate. Thus, SBC has not passed 52% of the applicable test criteria in Indiana.

Table 2 - Indiana

Score	PMR1	PMR2	PMR3*	PMR4	PMR5	**Total**
Satisfied	65	3	29	5	27	**129**
Not Satisfied	31	0	0	9	26	**66**
Indeterminate	30	0	0	26	19	**75**
Not Applicable	0	0	0	32	0	**32**

* PMR3 and PMR3B results are combined for reporting.

[55] *See* BearingPoint Illinois Performance Metrics Update, dated August 1, 2003; BearingPoint Errata issued August 5, 2003, revising page 5 of the BearingPoint Illinois Performance Metrics Update dated August 1, 2003.

[56] *See* BearingPoint Indiana Interim OSS and Performance Measurement Status Report, dated May 12, 2003 at 11.

75. As Table 3 shows, SBC has passed 57% and failed 22% of the applicable test criteria in BearingPoint's test in Ohio.[57] The remaining 21% are indeterminate. Thus, SBC has not yet passed 43% of the applicable test criteria in Ohio.

Table 3 - Ohio

Score	PMR1	PMR2	PMR3	PMR3B	PMR4	PMR5	**Total**
Satisfied	85	3	15	14	10	27	**154**
Not Satisfied	29	0	0	0	3	28	**60**
Indeterminate	12	0	0	0	27	17	**56**
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	32	0	**32**

76. As Table 4 shows, SBC has passed 57% and failed 24% of the applicable test criteria in BearingPoint's test in Wisconsin.[58] The remaining 19% are indeterminate. As a consequence, SBC has not yet passed 43% of the applicable test criteria in Wisconsin.

Table 4 - Wisconsin

Score	PMR1	PMR2	PMR3	PMR3B	PMR4	PMR5	**Total**
Satisfied	85	3	15	14	10	27	**154**
Not Satisfied	29	0	0	0	3	34	**66**
Indeterminate	12	0	0	0	27	11	**50**
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0	32	0	**32**

77. SBC's performance during BearingPoint's PMR tests in the four states is substantially worse than that of BOCs that have received 271 authorization in states where

[57] *See* BearingPoint Ohio OSS Evaluation Project Report, dated May 23, 2003 at 215-233 (referring to PMR2, PMR3, PMR3B); BearingPoint Ohio Performance Metrics Update, June 30, 2003 at 5; BearingPoint July 17, 2003 Errata, revising page 5 of the BearingPoint Ohio Performance Metrics Update, June 30, 2003.

[58] *See* BearingPoint Wisconsin Performance Metrics Report, dated June 30, 2003 at 5; BearingPoint Errata, dated July 17, 2003, revising page 5 of the BearingPoint Wisconsin Performance Metrics Report, dated June 30, 2003.

BearingPoint has conducted similar PMR tests. As explained below, in other states where BearingPoint has conducted similar PMR testing and the BOC has obtained 271 approval, the BOC passed *96-100 percent* of the test criteria in the PMR tests.

78. *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Application*. When BellSouth filed its Georgia/Louisiana Section 271 application, two performance metrics audits had been completed by BearingPoint and the third metrics audit was in progress. The five test segments in BearingPoint's Georgia PMR test are similar to those in the BearingPoint PMR tests conducted in the four states covered by SBC's application.[59] While BellSouth's Georgia/Louisiana 271 application was pending, BellSouth passed approximately 99 percent of the test criteria in Audit I and 100% of the test criteria in Audit II.[60] Although a third BearingPoint audit was not complete during the pendency of Bell South's Georgia/Louisiana 271 application, BellSouth

[59] The BearingPoint four-state tests include test segment PMR3B which assesses SBC's procedures for recalculating remedy payments associated with restated performance measures. PMR3B evaluates SBC's documentation only and does not assess the accuracy of SBC's performance remedy calculations. In contrast, in Audit III in Georgia, BearingPoint evaluated BellSouth's performance remedy calculations. *See*, *e.g.*, Varner Supp. Aff., ¶ 56, *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Proceeding*. Audits I and II in Georgia did not evaluate the accuracy of BellSouth's SEEM calculations.

Additionally, the PMR4 (Data Integrity) and PMR5 (Metrics Replication) tests in Georgia are more stringent than those in the four states. In the Georgia audits, BellSouth was deemed to have passed PMR4 and PMR5 at the sub-metric level if 100 percent of the processed records corresponded with BearingPoint's test CLEC transactions data and the values reported by BellSouth matched exactly the values calculated by BearingPoint. In contrast, in the BearingPoint Four-State test, SBC can pass PMR4 if "95 percent of required source records are included for each measure set evaluated in the measurement group" and "95 percent of sample field values in processed data are consistent with unprocessed data from source systems for each measure set evaluated in the measure group." *See, e.g.,* Ohio Performance Metrics Update, June 30, 2003 at 61, 63. Similarly, in the BearingPoint Four-State test SBC can pass PMR5 if BearingPoint replicates 95 percent of the metric values within the measure group. *Id.* at 134.

[60] *See, e.g.,* Varner Aff. ¶ 407, *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Proceeding*; Varner Supp. Aff. ¶¶ 49, 55, *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Proceeding*; Varner Supp. Reply Aff., ¶ 20, *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Proceeding. See also* BellSouth GA OSS Testing Evaluation Interim Status Report, dated May 24, 2002 at 1.

contended that Audits I and II "standing alone should provide the Commission with a high degree of confidence that BellSouth's performance data are reliable."[61] When this Commission approved BellSouth's Georgia/Louisiana 271 application, it found that BellSouth's data were accurate based upon, *inter alia*, Audit I in which BellSouth satisfied approximately 99 percent of the test criteria and Audit II in which BellSouth satisfied 100 percent of the test criteria.[62]

79. *BellSouth Five State 271 Application.* When BellSouth filed its 271 application for authority to provide in-region, interLATA services in Alabama, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina ("Five State 271 Application"), BellSouth, once again, contended that Audits I and II conducted in Georgia "standing alone, should provide the Commission with a high degree of confidence that BellSouth's performance data are reliable."[63] It its Order on the Five State 271 Application, the Commission found that BellSouth's OSS in Georgia were "substantially the same as the OSS in each of the five states," and that BearingPoint's third-party test conducted in Georgia was relevant and would be considered in evaluating BellSouth's Five State 271 application.[64] At the time this Commission approved BellSouth's Five State Application, Audits I and II in Georgia had been completed, and BellSouth had passed 100 percent of the test criteria.[65]

---

[61] Varner Supp. Aff. ¶ 33, *Georgia Louisiana 271 Proceeding.*

[62] *See, e.g., Georgia/Louisiana 271 Order* ¶ 19.

[63] Varner Aff. ¶ 130, *Five State 271 Application*.

[64] *BellSouth Five State 271 Order* ¶ 130.

[65] *See* BellSouth GA OSS Testing Evaluation Interim Status Report, dated September 6, 2002 at 1.

80. *Florida/Tennessee 271 Application*. Consistent with its approach in its Georgia/Louisiana and Five State 271 applications, BellSouth argued in the *Florida/Tennessee 271 Proceeding* that BearingPoint's completed Georgia Audits I and II which at that time had "closed with all evaluation criteria satisfied" should "standing alone . . . provide the Commission with a high degree of confidence that BellSouth's performance data are reliable."[66] This Commission, citing *inter alia,* its *Five State 271 Order* and *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Order,* as well as BellSouth's testimony in the *Florida/Tennessee 271 Proceeding,* found, once again, that BellSouth's performance data were accurate.[67]

81. *New Jersey 271 Application.* When this Commission approved Verizon's 271 New Jersey application, Verizon had passed 100 percent of the test criteria in BearingPoint's five PMR test segments.[68] In its decision, this Commission, "noting the thoroughness and rigorousness with which KPMG conducted its military-style test . . .," saw "no need to question the reliability of the data Verizon submitted in its application."[69]

82. *Pennsylvania 271 Application.* When Verizon applied for authority to provide in-region, interLATA services in Pennsylvania, Verizon satisfied over 96 percent of the

[66] Varner Aff. ¶ 82, *Florida/Tennessee 271 Proceeding.*

[67] *See Florida/Tennessee 271 Order* ¶ 16 n. 47 (citing initial and reply affidavits of BellSouth's witness Alphonso Varner and the Commission's *BellSouth Five State 271 Order* and *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Order*).

[68] *See* Verizon New Jersey Comments at 101, *New Jersey 271 Proceeding*; Guerard/Canny/DeVito Decl., ¶ 130, *New Jersey 271 Proceeding*; BearingPoint Verizon New Jersey Inc. OSS Evaluation Project Report, dated October 12, 2001 at 355-409.

[69] *New Jersey 271 Order* ¶ *89.*

test criteria in the PMR1-PMR4 tests."[70] Furthermore, although Verizon satisfied 63 percent of the test criteria in BearingPoint's first PMR5 (replication) test, in a subsequent test ordered by the Pennsylvania PUC, BearingPoint successfully replicated 99 percent of the metrics values that Verizon reported.[71]

83. *Virginia 271 Application*. Similarly, when Verizon filed its Section 271 application for authority to provide in-region, interLATA services in Virginia, Verizon passed 100 percent of the applicable test criteria in all segments of the BearingPoint PMR test.[72]

84. As the foregoing demonstrates, in those proceedings in which BearingPoint has conducted essentially the same five-segment metrics test that it is conducting in the four states, the BOC passed 96-100% percent of the test criteria in the PMR test. In stark contrast, SBC has passed only 48 to 57% of the applicable test criteria in the four states in its application. In view of the PMR test results of other BOCs that have obtained 271 approval, this Commission must not and should not lower the compliance bar and approve SBC's application on the basis of the current record.[73]

---

[70] Guerard/Canny/DeVito Decl. ¶ 134, *Pennsylvania 271 Proceeding*.

[71] Verizon Pennsylvania 271 Application, App. B, Tab BB-2, Letter from James L. McNulty to Verizon PA, Inc., dated January 5, 2001; *id.*, App. B, Tab F-3, BearingPoint's January Metrics Replication Report at 3-6.

[72] *See* BearingPoint Verizon Virginia Inc. OSS Evaluation Project Final Report Version 2.0, dated April 15, 2002 ("BearingPoint Virginia Report") at 421-483; Verizon Virginia 271 Application at 11, 12; Guerard/Canny/DeVito Decl., *Virginia 271 Proceeding*.

[73] Although this Commission has stated that it "cannot as a general matter insist that all audits must be completed at the time a Section 271 application is filed at the Commission," it has also explained that it "will give greater weight to evidence that has been audited." *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Order,* ¶ 19 at n. 68.

2. SBC's Attacks On The BearingPoint PMR Tests Are In Stark Contrast To Its Arguments On BearingPoint's OSS Functionality Tests.

85. In various parts of its Application, SBC dismisses BearingPoint's findings during the performance metrics tests or otherwise attacks BearingPoint's methodology. Thus, for example, as noted above, SBC contends that BearingPoint's replication standards are far too exacting. However, SBC cannot legitimately challenge BearingPoint's standards since it insisted that BearingPoint should serve as the third-party tester and participated in the development of BearingPoint's Master Test Plans for each of the four states.

86. Additionally, in an effort to vindicate its reliance on the E&Y audits, SBC notes that the BearingPoint audits are incomplete and suggests that BearingPoint's findings are of no probative value because they are merely "interim test findings."[74] However, as the Department of Justice aptly observed in connection with SBC's Michigan 271 application, "the BearingPoint metrics audit and its findings to date should not be ignored or minimized simply because the audit is not progressing as fast as SBC desires," particularly when "SBC itself appears to be responsible for some of the delays in completion of BearingPoint's audit."[75] Furthermore, although SBC attempts to diminish the importance of BearingPoint's "Not Satisfied" findings by suggesting that they are meaningless, "interim findings," SBC cannot escape the fact that BearingPoint's "Not Satisfied" findings denote the existence of a data error or problem.

[74] *See, e.g.,* Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶¶ 33-34.

[75] DOJ Evaluation (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) at 13 n.63.

87. Rather curiously, SBC's attacks on the BearingPoint performance metrics tests – which mirror the tests that other BOCs have passed at the time of 271 approval – are in stark contrast to its arguments heralding BearingPoint's OSS functionality tests. Noting that BearingPoint's third-party OSS functionality tests in each of the four states covered in its application are "modeled after the tests conducted in New York and Florida," SBC contends that the BearingPoint third-party OSS test confirms that the CLECs have nondiscriminatory access to its OSS.[76] Indeed, in embellishing these assertions, SBC notes that its systems underwent "an exhaustive OSS Test" by BearingPoint in each of the states which employed "a military-style, test-until-pass philosophy" that it passed "with flying colors."[77]

88. Notably, although BearingPoint's performance metrics tests conducted in the four states also are modeled after tests conducted in states where BOCs have previously obtained 271 approval and although BearingPoint employs the same "test-until-pass philosophy" in its PMR tests, SBC contends that this Commission can and should rely solely on the E&Y audits, or alternatively, should ignore BearingPoint's findings in the PMR4 and PMR5 tests. SBC's willingness to embrace, for purposes of this Application, the operational aspects of BearingPoint's third-party OSS tests and its efforts to otherwise denigrate and minimize BearingPoint's findings in the performance metrics tests simply highlight that SBC simply seeks to escape from BearingPoint's PMR findings that are not to its liking.

[76] Application at iv.

[77] *Id.* at 56-57.

89. As demonstrated in more detail below, BearingPoint's tests have uncovered and continue to uncover substantial defects in SBC's performance monitoring and reporting processes. Because BearingPoint's tests are far from complete, BearingPoint may uncover other deficiencies in SBC's performance data. As a consequence, based upon the current record, SBC has not demonstrated and cannot demonstrate that its performance data are accurate and reliable, a fundamental showing in all prior 271 applications.

3. BearingPoint Has Uncovered Substantial Data Problems During The PRM1 Test.

90. The PMR1 test assesses "the adequacy and completeness of key policies and procedures for collecting and storing performance data" and the extent to which SBC's "operations are consistent with the policies and procedures."[78] During this test, BearingPoint has examined and is examining the following criteria: (1) whether the documentation for SBC's performance data collection and storage processes is complete and up-to-date; (2) whether the documentation for technical requirements and data processes is complete; (3) whether procedures exist to assure adequate capacity for collecting and storing performance data; (4) whether SBC's processing procedures have sufficient controls to assure accuracy in performance reporting; (5) whether procedures exist to assure regularly scheduled back-ups of key data; (6) whether data have been retained in accordance with regulatory requirements; and (7) whether procedures exist to assure that access to performance data are restricted to authorized personnel.

[78] *See, e.g.*, Illinois MTP dated May 2, 2002 at 23.

91. During the PMR1 test, each of these seven criteria is applied to 18 performance measurement families. The status of the PMR1 test in each state is as follows:

BearingPoint PMR1 Test Results					
		Indiana 5/12/03	Illinois 8/1/03	Wisconsin 6/30/03	Ohio 6/30/03
PMR1	Satisfied	65	80	85	85
	Not Satisfied	31	27	29	29
	Indeterminate	30	19	12	12
	Not Applicable	0	0	0	0

92. SBC contends that the "PMR1 'Not Satisfied' test points are driven by very narrow exceptions relating to technical documentation (Exceptions 188 and 187) or data retention policy (Exception 186) . . . ."[79] SBC's arguments cannot withstand analysis. As explained in more detail below, the defects in SBC's technical documentation that BearingPoint has uncovered impact numerous performance metrics — including those that SBC has admitted are key measures.

93. **Technical Documentation.** During the PMR1 tests, SBC provided its technical documentation which identifies "the systems used, the data required, and the step-by-step logic used to arrive at the published performance measurement results."[80] Although SBC, in its Application, has heralded the completeness of its technical documentation and stated that it

[79] Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 69.

[80] BearingPoint Exception 187, dated February 18, 2003 at 1.

fully expects that the remaining "Not Satisfied" findings "will also be found 'Satisfactory,'"[81] BearingPoint has found significant defects in SBC's documentation.

94. **Exception 187 (IL, IN, OH, WI).** SBC's unprocessed data, which are first captured in various source systems, "undergo a transformation process in which the data fields necessary for calculating metric results may pass through more than one system before they reach the reporting systems, where the metrics calculations are done."[82] BearingPoint notes that "[i]t is from these reporting systems that SBC Ameritech pulls the data used to calculate and pulled the performance metrics results posted in the CLEC website."[83] However, in Exception 187 which was opened in the PMR1 test on February 13, 2003, BearingPoint found that SBC's technical documentation that captures this process and contains the calculation logic for its performance results is inaccurate or incomplete.[84]

95. In Exception 187, Version 5, issued on July 11, 2003, BearingPoint updated its analysis of SBC's deficiencies in this area. In this regard, in Version 5 of Exception 187, BearingPoint reported that, as of July 10, 2003, the step-by-step logic that SBC uses to

[81] Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 72; *see id.* ¶ 69.

[82] *See, e.g.,* BearingPoint Indiana Interim OSS and Performance Measurement Report, dated May 12, 2003 at 25.

[83] *Id.*

[84] BearingPoint Exception 187, dated February 18, 2003.

calculate its performance results is inaccurate with respect to nine measurement groups and 16 measures – including measures that SBC concedes are key measures.[85]

96. Thus, for example, SBC has admitted that Performance Measurement 18 (Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)) is a key measure.[86] In Exception 187, Version 5, however, BearingPoint has found that SBC's calculation logic for Performance Measurement 18 is inaccurate.[87]

97. Similarly, Exception 187, Version 5, also reveals that SBC's calculation logic for four measures in the Directory Assistance Database measurement group is inaccurate – including Performance Measurement 110 (Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database Within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs) – which SBC admits is a key measure.[88]

98. BearingPoint also has found that SBC's calculation logic underlying its maintenance and repair results are defective. In this regard, in Exception 187, Version 5, BearingPoint found that SBC's calculation logic for two maintenance and repair measures are inaccurate, including Performance Measurement 54.1 (Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports), which SBC concedes is a "key measure."

[85] The nine measure groups and 16 measures are: Billing (PM 18); Collocation (PM MI 4); Directory Assistance Database (PMs 110, 111, 112, and 113); Maintenance and Repair (PMs 54, 54.1); NXX (PMs 117, 118); Other (PMs MI 9, MI 11); Poles, Conduits and Rights of Way (PM 105); Pre-Order (PM 1.1); and Provisioning (PMs 56, 56.1).

[86] *See* Ehr/Fioretti Aff., Attach. D.

[87] BearingPoint Exception 187, Version 5, dated July 11, 2003.

[88] *See* Ehr/Fioretti Aff., Attach. D.

99. Equally infirm is SBC's step-by-step logic underlying its provisioning results. In Exception 187, Version 5, BearingPoint found that SBC's calculation logic is inaccurate with respect to two "key" provisioning measures (*i.e.* Performance Measurements 56 (Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date) and 56.1 (Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date for Loop with LNP)).[89]

100. Furthermore, SBC concedes that Performance Measurements MI 9 (Percentage Missing FOCs) and MI 11 (Average Interface Outage Notification) are key measures.[90] However, in Exception 187, Version 5, BearingPoint has reported that SBC's calculation logic underlying these two key metrics is inaccurate.

101. The inaccuracies in SBC's calculation logic which are discussed in Exception 187, Version 5, highlight the frivolity of SBC's claims that it has somehow proven that its performance data are complete, accurate, and reliable. The E&Y audits were not designed to and did not address deficiencies in SBC's technical documentation. Significantly, BearingPoint could uncover even more defects in SBC's calculation logic as testing continues. BearingPoint, which is continuing to receive and evaluate SBC's technical documentation, has not completed its evaluation of 39 percent of the performance measurements that are subject to examination under Exception 187.[91] In view of the substantial deficiencies that BearingPoint has

[89] *See, id.*

[90] *See, id.*

[91] *See also* SBC's Response to Exception 187, Version 5, dated July 17, 2003 (noting that SBC is currently updating its technical documentation to address BearingPoint's findings with respect to seven

(footnote continued on next page)

uncovered to date in the calculation logic underlying SBC's performance data and the testing that remains to be completed, SBC cannot legitimately contend that it has shown that its performance data are accurate and reliable.

102. **Exception 188 (IL, IN, OH, WI)**. On February 18, 2003, BearingPoint opened Exception 188, finding that SBC's data flow diagrams (which document data flows from the Performance Measurement Reporting System to source systems) and data element maps (which document data flows from the Performance Measurement Reporting System to source systems at the field level) do "not consistently present an adequate depiction of the flow of data from the source systems to the performance measurement reporting systems for certain performance measurements."[92]

103. Correct mapping of data fields is essential to consistent and accurate performance reporting. SBC's data flow diagrams and data element maps are the blueprints that serve as the basis upon which SBC analysts and programmers manage the systems and data underlying SBC's reported results. These documents also are used to effect the changes in the performance monitoring system that are necessary to correct any defects in SBC's implementation of the metrics business rules which are identified in exceptions and observations during metrics testing. When data flow diagrams and data element maps are inaccurate and incomplete, system changes will be made on the basis of incorrect specifications that can

---

(footnote continued from previous page)
measures, and that BearingPoint is currently evaluating SBC's technical requirements documentation for 58 additional measures).

[92] BearingPoint Exception 188, dated February 18, 2003 at 1.

substantially increase the risk that errors and internal inconsistencies will be introduced into the changed systems. In assessing the impact of Exception 188, BearingPoint explained that "[a]ccurate documentation, which describes the flow of performance data through SBC Ameritech's systems, is necessary to maintain consistency in the resulting calculation process and to enable effective management of changes to the data flows."[93]

104. In Version 5 of Exception 188, issued on July 11, 2003, BearingPoint reported that, as of July 10, 2003, SBC's DFDs and DEMs for nine measurement groups and *90* measures are inaccurate – including SBC's documentation for a host of measures which SBC admits are key measures.[94]

105. Thus, for example, Version 5 of Exception 188 shows that SBC's technical documentation is inaccurate with respect to 14 ordering metrics, including the following measures which SBC concedes are "key" metrics:[95]

- Performance Measure 5 (Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) Returned Within 'X' Hours)
- Performance Measure 7 (Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems)

[93] *Id.* at 2.

[94] BearingPoint Exception 188, Version 5, dated July 11, 2003. The nine measurement groups and 90 measures are: Directory Assistance Database (PMs 110, 111, 112, 113); Facilities Modification (PMs CW 11, WI 9); Interconnection Trunks (PMs 73, 74, 75, 76, 78); Local Number Portability (PMs 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101); Maintenance and Repair (PMs 37, 37.1, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 52, 53, 54, 54.1, 65, 65.1, 66, 67, 68, 69); Order (PMs 5, 6, 7, 7.1, 8, 10, 10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 11, 11.2, 13, MI 2); Other (PMs CW 5, IN 1, MI 9, MI 13, MI 15, WI 1, WI 2); Pre-Order (PMs 2, MI 10, MI 16); and Provisioning (PMs 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 55, 55.1, 55.2, 55.3, 56, 56.1, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63).

[95] *See, e.g.*, Ehr/Fioretti Aff., Attach D.

- Performance Measure 10 (Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR)

- Performance Measure 10.1 (Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order)

- Performance Measure 10.2 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours)

- Performance Measure 10.3 (Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours)

- Performance Measure 10.4 (Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices)

- Performance Measure 11 (Mean Time to Return Rejects)

- Performance Measure 11.2 (Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects That Are Received Through the Manual Process)

- Performance Measure 13 (Order Process Percent Flow-Through)

106. Additionally, Version 5 of Exception 188 reveals that SBC's technical documentation is inaccurate with respect to seventeen maintenance and repair measures, including the following which SBC concedes are key metrics:

- Performance Measure 37 (Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS))

- Performance Measure 37.1 (Trouble Report Rate (Net of Installation and Repeat Reports))

- Performance Measure 38 (Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS))

- Performance Measure 40 (Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours (Resale POTS))

- Performance Measure 41 (Percent Repeat Reports (Resale POTS))

- Performance Measure 54.1 (Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports)

- Performance Measure 67 (Mean Time to Restore Unbundled Network Elements)

107. Additionally, Version 5 of Exception 188 confirms that SBC's technical documentation is inaccurate with respect to twenty-eight provisioning measures, including the following which SBC admits are key metrics:

- Performance Measure 27 (Mean Installation Interval)

- Performance Measure 28 (Percent POTS/UNE-P Installation Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date)

- Performance Measure 29 (Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale POTS))

- Performance Measure 35 (Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (1-30) of Installation)

- Performance Measure 45 (Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations))

- Performance Measure 56 (Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date)

- Performance Measure 56.1 (Percent Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date For Loop with LNP)

- Performance Measure 58 (Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Unbundled Network Elements))

108. Furthermore, in Version 5 of Exception 188, BearingPoint has found that SBC's technical documentation is inaccurate with respect to ten local number portability measures, including the documentation for two measures that SBC concedes are key measures

(*i.e.* Performance Measures 91 (Percent of LNP Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines) and 96 (Percentage Pre-Mature Disconnects for LNP Orders)).

109. Additionally, in Version 5 of Exception 188, BearingPoint has found that SBC's technical documentation is inaccurate with respect to seven measures in the Other Measures category, including two measures that SBC admits are key measures. In this regard, BearingPoint has found that SBC's technical documentation is inaccurate with respect to Performance Measure MI 9 (Percentage Missing FOCs) – a measure that SBC concedes is a key measure.

110. Critically, BearingPoint also has found that SBC's technical documentation is inaccurate with respect to Performance Measurement MI 13 (Percent Loss Notification Within One Hour of Service Order Completion) – another key measure. Despite AT&T's request, SBC has yet to provide AT&T with the Data Flow Diagrams and Data Element Maps that it uses to calculate line loss notifications under Version 1.9 of the business rules. Indeed, in a recent *ex parte*, SBC confirmed that it began reporting results for PM MI 13 using Version 1.9 of the business rules on April 21, 2003.[96] However, BearingPoint already has found that SBC's technical documentation is inaccurate for Performance Measurement MI 13 under Version 1.8 of the business rules.

111. To be sure, other deficiencies in SBC's technical documentation may be uncovered during the course of BearingPoint's testing. BearingPoint has found that SBC's

[96] *See* Letter from Geoffrey M. Klineberg to Marlene H. Dortch, dated July 31, 2003, Attach. at 5.

technical documentation is inaccurate with respect to 59 percent of the performance measures, and BearingPoint has not completed testing nine percent of the measures which are subject to evaluation.[97] In that connection, SBC has informed BearingPoint that it is planning system changes which will impact the data flows of 13 measure groups.[98] The performance measure groups that will be impacted by these system changes are: 911, Billing, Bona Fide Requests, Directory Assistance and Operator Services, Directory Assistance Database, Facilities Modifications, Interconnection Trunks, Local Number Portability, Miscellaneous Administrative, NXX, Ordering, Other, and Structure.[99] BearingPoint is currently in the process of assessing the effects of these system changes on the performance measurement groups at issue.

112. In an effort to diminish the importance of these findings, SBC contends that the technical documentation issues that are currently the subject of BearingPoint exceptions are of no consequence because they "are not associated with issues that affect the accuracy or reliability of reported results."[100] Nothing could be further from the truth.

113. The processes that are conducted daily, weekly and monthly to collect and tabulate performance results rely on the underlying technical documentation to generate

[97] *See also* SBC's Response to Exception 188, Version 5, dated July 17, 2003 (noting that SBC is in the process of updating its DEMs and DFMs for 60 measures to address BearingPoint's concerns, and that BearingPoint is continuing to evaluate SBC's documentation relating to 14 additional measures).

[98] *See, e.g.,* BearingPoint Illinois OSS Evaluation Project Report dated December 20, 2002 at 18.

[99] *Id.*

[100] Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 93.

performance data in accordance with the business rules governing the metrics. Clearly, inaccuracies in the step-by-step calculation logic and defects in SBC's data flow diagrams and data element maps can spawn errors in reported results and result in system changes that are based on incorrect specifications. Under such circumstances, SBC cannot legitimately contend that the technical documentation issues uncovered by BearingPoint during the PMR1 tests are somehow irrelevant to a determination regarding the accuracy and reliability of its data.

114. **Data Retention**. Unlike the E&Y audit, the BearingPoint PMR1 test includes an assessment of SBC's data retention practices. SBC notes that "nine 'Not Satisfied' test points are due to the current Exception 186."[101] SBC insists, however, that Exception 186 is open only because "a few systems" have not "retained historical data in BearingPoint's desired format for the requisite period evaluated by BearingPoint."[102]

115. Exception 186 was initially opened in all four states on February 10, 2003. In Version 3 of Exception 186, dated June 23, 2003, BearingPoint has found that SBC failed to retain data for six systems in accordance with the 18-month benchmark that BearingPoint established during the Illinois, Ohio, Indiana and Wisconsin tests.[103] According to BearingPoint,

[101] *Id.* ¶ 85.

[102] *Id.* ¶ 87.

[103] Exception 186 applies to Michigan, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin. As BearingPoint points out in Exception 186, Michigan's regulatory requirements require the retention of data for "24 months after the conclusion of the year in which the data was collected or 12 months after the issuance of the audit report, whichever is later." BearingPoint also notes that, because there are no explicit data retention requirements in Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin, it is using an 18-month benchmark for the retention of data in those states.

in accordance with the 18-month benchmark that BearingPoint established, SBC should have retained its performance data that have been generated since December 2001. However, Exception 186 explains that SBC has retained only: (1) ACIS data generated since May 2002; (2) ARIS/EXACT data generated since April 2002; (3) CABS data generated since May 2002; (4) CAMPS data generated since August 2002; (5) DUF Parity File data generated in the past 90 days; and (6) Manual Directory Assistance Database Measures data generated since October 2002.[104] Furthermore, BearingPoint is in the process of retesting SBC's data from the Manual-EBTA Clear Close, NSDB and PAWS Website systems.[105] Thus, it remains to be seen whether SBC will successfully demonstrate that it has retained its data in accordance with BearingPoint's 18-month benchmark.

4. BearingPoint Has Uncovered Substantial Errors During The PMR4 Test.

116. The Metrics Data Integrity Verification and Validation Review (PMR4) test conducted by BearingPoint "evaluates the overall policies and practices for processing the data used by SBC Ameritech in the production of the reported performance metrics and standards."[106] During this test, BearingPoint assesses whether: (1) "[r]equired source records are included in data";[107] (2) inappropriate records are included in the processed data which are used to calculate performance results; (3) the records in the processed data which are used to calculate

[104] BearingPoint Exception 186, Version 3, dated June 23, 2003.

[105] *Id.*

[106] *See, e.g.,* BearingPoint Illinois Master Test Plan, dated May 2, 2002 at 28.

[107] *See, e.g.,*, BearingPoint Illinois Performance Metrics Update, dated August 1, 2003 at 81.

performance results are consistent with unprocessed data from SBC's source systems; and (4) data fields in the processed data used to calculate performance results are consistent with the unprocessed data from SBC's source systems. The status of the PMR4 tests in the four states is as follows:

BearingPoint PMR4 Test Results					
		Indiana 5/12/03	Illinois 8/01/03	Wisconsin 6/30/03	Ohio 6/30/03
PMR4	Satisfied	5	13	11	11
	Not Satisfied	9	3	3	3
	Indeterminate	26	24	26	26
	Not Applicable	32	32	32	32

117. **Exception 175 (IL, IN, OH, WI).** BearingPoint issued a "Not Satisfied" finding for one test criterion in the PMR 4 test (PMR 4-4-N) based upon Exception 175, issued on September 26, 2002, in which Bearing Point found that SBC "is using incorrect data in its calculation of Performance Measurements 114 (Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers) and 115 (Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers)" in its performance data generated from January through June 2002.[108] In this regard, BearingPoint found that: (1) SBC incorrectly used the scheduled start time of the Frame Due Time (FDT) cut, instead of the actual start time; and (2) SBC incorrectly used the time the CLEC called the Local Operations Center as the start time for a Coordinated Hot Cut (CHC), instead of

[108] Bearing Point Exception 175, dated September 26, 2002; *see also* BearingPoint Illinois Metrics Update, dated August 1, 2003 at 126.

the actual cutover time when calculating performance results. BearingPoint found that these errors affected SBC's performance data in Michigan, as well as the four states covered in SBC's Four-State Application.[109]

118. In response to Exception 175, SBC stated that it planned to propose certain changes to the business rules governing Performance Measurement 114 to assure consistency between the business rules and the definition governing the metric with respect to the CHC disaggregation. Additionally, SBC asserted that, effective May 2003, it implemented procedures to capture premature disconnects. In its disposition report, BearingPoint stated that, "*[i]f* the new LOC procedures produce accurate results regarding whether a customer has been disconnected 10 or more minutes prior to a CLEC call time during a coordinated cutover, it would appear that SBC Ameritech would have a reasonable basis, including the required underlying data, for calculating Performance Measurement 114 consistently with the published metrics business rules."[110]

119. Noting that SBC indicated that it also planned to propose certain changes relating to the CHC disaggregation for Performance Measurement 115 and that SBC also had indicated that, in May 2003, it planned to calculate results, "consistent with those proposed changes," BearingPoint found that *if* the proposed changes are approved during the collaborative

[109] *See*, Bearing Point Exception 175, Version 2, dated January 10, 2003 (noting that the errors identified in Exception 175 that affected SBC's Michigan, Illinois, Indiana and Ohio performance data also applied to SBC's Wisconsin data).

[110] BearingPoint Exception 175, Version 2, Disposition Report dated January 10, 2003 at 2 (emphasis added).

process and applied consistently, "these modifications would appear to provide a reasonable basis for measuring the underlying activities associated with coordinated conversions…."[111]

120. In response to BearingPoint's findings related to the FDT disaggregation, SBC reported that it implemented procedures with its September 2002 data to capture the actual start time of the FDT. After BearingPoint proposed to close Exception 175 as "Not Satisfied," SBC requested additional time to explore further retesting. The BearingPoint disposition report reveals, however, that because "no specific retesting is planned… BearingPoint has no further work to perform on this Exception Report at this time, and proposes to close it."[112] Thus, at this juncture, SBC has not resolved to BearingPoint's satisfaction the errors that are the subject of Exception 175. And, importantly, as SBC concedes, the E&Y audit did not identify or address the "Coordinated Hot Cut ('CHC') disaggregation issues that were included in this Exception by BearingPoint."[113]

121. **Exceptions 181 (IL, IN, OH) and 182 (WI)**. BearingPoint determined that SBC failed two test criteria (PMR 4-3-J and PMR 4-4-J) based upon Exceptions 181 and 182 which found that SBC's "processed records for Performance Measure 104.1 ('the average time it takes to unlock the 911 record') appear to be inconsistent with the unprocessed records from SBC Ameritech's source systems for the January 2002 reporting month."[114] BearingPoint

[111] *Id.*

[112] *Id.* at 3.

[113] Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 102 n. 53, Attach. B at 6.

[114] BearingPoint Exception 181, dated December 17, 2002; BearingPoint Exception 182 dated January 14, 2003. *See also* BearingPoint Illinois Metrics Update, dated August 1, 2003 at 116-117.

found 14 cases where the 911 database administrator "unlocked" a record but could not locate an order (in MOR/Tel) that relates to the unlock. BearingPoint also found 14 other orders that should have been, but were not, unlocked (in the UNLOK report). BearingPoint also found three records in the data used to generate the performance data that were not in UNLOK or MOR/Tel.

122. SBC contends that, commencing with its July 2002 results, SBC and its external vendor "implemented several process changes to ensure that manually unlocked numbers were included in the results file and that each step in the measurement reporting process was appropriately followed."[115] SBC also notes that it has enhanced its computer code effective with its January 2003 results to "improve the match rate between 911 unlock and service order completion records."[116] Furthermore, SBC claims that E&Y identified these same errors during its audit and validated the corrective actions that SBC has taken to resolve these issues.

123. Although SBC contends that E&Y has validated the process changes that it implemented with its July 2002 results and has verified that SBC's January 2003 data reflect other computer code improvements that SBC effected to assure there is a match between its 911 unlocked and service order completion records, BearingPoint's Open Exceptions Status Report indicates that the purported corrective action that SBC took has not been effective. BearingPoint's current Open Exceptions Status Report reveals that, on March 25, 2003, SBC conceded that its January 2003 data – the data that SBC contends here reflect its corrective

[115] Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 109.

[116] *Id.*

action – were not accurate and could not be used to retest Exception 181.[117] Indeed, BearingPoint noted that SBC "plans to have corrections in place for its February 2003 data."[118] Critically, although E&Y, during its audits, purportedly validated that "[e]ffective with January 2003 results reported in February 2003, the Company implemented enhancements to match 9-1-1 database unlock records to completed service order records," the January 2003 results purportedly validated by E&Y and which SBC touts in its application are inaccurate by SBC's own admission.[119] Furthermore, as of July 29, 2003, BearingPoint apparently was sufficiently concerned about the problems it was encountering with SBC data that it plans to issue a new version of Exception 181. Thus, despite SBC's contrary claims, it has not demonstrated that it has resolved all issues that are associated with Exception 181. Moreover, the failure of E&Y to detect that SBC's January 2003 results reflecting SBC's corrective action are inaccurate provides further confirmation of the inherent unreliability of E&Y's audit and retesting procedures.

5. BearingPoint Has Uncovered Substantial Errors During The PMR5 Test.

124. During the PMR5 test, BearingPoint is assessing the processes that SBC uses to calculate its reported results and the consistency of SBC's calculations with respect to the business rules governing each performance measure. During this test, BearingPoint evaluates the following criteria: (1) whether the required disaggregated measures are included in reported results; (2) whether BearingPoint can replicate SBC's values; (3) whether SBC's implementation

[117] BearingPoint Open Exceptions Status Report dated July 29, 2003, Exception 181, at 1.

[118] *Id.*

[119] *See* Ehr/Fioretti Aff., Attach. A-1 Illinois, Section V, Issue 13 at 31.

of the measure is consistent with the business rules governing the measure; and (4) whether SBC's data exclusions are consistent with the business rules governing the measure.

125. The status of the BearingPoint PMR5 tests in the four states is as follows:

BearingPoint PMR5 Test Results					
		Indiana 5/12/03	Illinois 8/01/03	Wisconsin 6/30/03	Ohio 6/30/03
PMR5	Satisfied	25	30	24	24
	Not Satisfied	34	37	37	31
	Indeterminate	13	5	11	17
	Not Applicable	0	0	0	0

126. In its PMR5-2 Blind Replication Status Summary Chart,[120] SBC purports to show, with respect to certain "key" measures, each material and non-material match between BearingPoint's reported values and those reported by SBC in the four states. Based on this analysis, SBC contends that "BearingPoint has been able to replicate or 'match' at a rate ranging from 88.6% to 97.0%," and that "[t]he four-state 'match' rate is 94.0%."[121] SBC further contends that the BearingPoint PMR5-2 test shows "a positive trend as replication continues, with the match rate improving in August and improving again in September . . . ."[122]

127. As a preliminary matter, SBC's list of so-called "key measures" is incomplete and omits measures that are important to competitive entry, such as Performance

[120] *See* Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 138.

[121] *Id.* ¶ 139.

[122] *Id.*

Measures 13.1 (Total Order Process Percent Flow Through), 30 (Percent Ameritech Missed Due Dates Due to Lack of Facilities), 33 (Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates), 2 (Percent Responses Received Within 'X' Seconds – OSS Interfaces) and 4 (OSS Interface Availability).

128. Putting these deficiencies aside, SBC's analysis is otherwise flawed. The results in SBC's blind replication summary tables are grossly distorted and skewed in SBC's favor. Indeed, in calculating the successful replication rate, SBC included in the denominator of its calculation the sum of replications completed and omitted the metrics that remain to be evaluated. As Attachment 3 shows, 49.8% of the metric values used during the blind replication test have not been evaluated by BearingPoint. Because SBC's blind replication summary omits metrics which remain to be evaluated, its successful replication rate is inflated.

129. Attachment 3 revises SBC's blind replication status by including the metrics that have not been evaluated. As Attachment 3 shows, in the four states BearingPoint has successfully replicated 47.2% of SBC's reported values in SBC's July, August and September 2002 results – a rate well below the 94% successful rate that SBC touts in its application. Attachment 3 also shows that SBC's claims of a positive trend in replication are erroneous. As Attachment 3 shows, BearingPoint was able to replicate 69.6% of SBC's CLEC values in its July 2002 data in the four states. However, in August, 2002, the successful replication rate for CLEC values declined to 45.8%, and, in September 2002, the rate declined even further to 25.5%.

130. Similarly, in July 2002, BearingPoint successfully replicated 73.2% of SBC's retail values in its July 2002 results. However, with respect to SBC's August 2002 results, the successful replication rate for retail results declined to 30.2%; and, with respect to its September 2002 results, the successful replication rate for retail data plummeted to an abysmally low 16.9%. Thus, if anything, the data show a negative trend as replication continues.

131. SBC's Blind Replication Status Summary[123] contains other discrepancies. In some instances, SBC's chart indicates that BearingPoint's testing on a given measure is in progress; however, the information available to the CLECs indicates that BearingPoint has concluded its testing on these measures. For example, SBC's Blind Replication Summary shows that BearingPoint successfully matched SBC's CLEC values reported in its July 2002 results for Performance Measurement 10 (Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR). SBC's Blind Replication Summary also shows that Observations 803 and 809 are correlated with this finding. However, the BearingPoint Open and Closed Observation Status Reports dated July 29, 2003, reveal that SBC has not successfully resolved the data errors that BearingPoint identified in these observations.

132. Similarly, SBC's Blind Replication Status Summary shows that BearingPoint successfully matched the values that SBC reported for its July and August 2002 data for Performance Measurement 11 (Mean Time to Return Rejects).[124] SBC's summary table

[123] *See* Ehr/Fioretti Aff., Attach. D.

[124] *Id*.

also shows that Observations 643 (Version 2) and 809 are observations which relate to this determination. However, according to BearingPoint's Closed Observations Status Report, BearingPoint closed Observation 643 as "Not Satisfied" because SBC "has no plans to restate" Performance Measurement 11 and there was "no further work that BearingPoint" could perform with respect to this observation "for the July and August 2002 data months."[125] Furthermore, BearingPoint closed Observation 809 as "Not Satisfied" because SBC would not modify its calculations to comply with the July 2002 business rules.[126] Thus, SBC's Blind Replication Status Summary which shows that BearingPoint successfully replicated the values that SBC reported for its July and August 2002 results for Performance Measurement 11 appears to be at odds with BearingPoint's observations status reports on Observations 643 and 809.

133. Other discrepancies relate to the timing of BearingPoint's findings. In some instances, SBC's Blind Replication Status Summary indicates that BearingPoint successfully matched SBC's values as of June 4, 2003. However, the information available to the CLECs indicates that BearingPoint did not successfully replicate the results until well after July. Attached as Attachments 4-7 are charts which revise SBC's Blind Replication Status Summary to highlight some of the discrepancies between the results in SBC's Blind Replication Status Summary and the findings discussed in BearingPoint's Open and Closed Observations

[125] BearingPoint Closed Observations Status Report, dated July 29, 2003, Observation 643, at 292.
[126] *Id.*, Observation 809, at 407.

Status Reports. These discrepancies serve as additional evidence that the results reported in SBC's Blind Replication Status Summary should and must be eyed with skepticism.

6. BearingPoint Found Data Errors That E&Y Did Not Identify.

134. BearingPoint's broader and more rigorous testing has detected errors in SBC's performance monitoring and reporting processes that E&Y did not address and could not have addressed during the course of its audits. Some of these errors that BearingPoint has uncovered presumably would have met E&Y's materiality standard. In other instances, because BearingPoint has not quantified the precise impact of these errors on SBC's performance results, it is impossible to determine whether these data problems would have met E&Y's materiality standard. In all events, a few illustrative examples of the defects uncovered by BearingPoint which are omitted in E&Y's reports are discussed below.

135. **Observation 643 (IL, IN, OH, WI)**. In Observation 643, issued on September 11, 2002, BearingPoint found during the PMR5 test that SBC was "truncating lower dateparts during time interval calculations" in its MOR/TEL data for PMs 6, 11, 11.2, and 95.[127] BearingPoint found that, if the benchmark standard for the affected measure is 60 minutes and SBC's actual interval for the measure was 60 minutes, 30 seconds, "SBC will count it as [a] pass for a 60-minute benchmark measure."[128] In responding to BearingPoint's observation, SBC

[127] BearingPoint Observation 643, dated September 11, 2002, at 1.

[128] *Id.*

dismissed BearingPoint's findings, stating that the defects that BearingPoint identified were not material and that it had no plans to restate its performance results. However, BearingPoint flatly rejected SBC's assertions regarding materiality and pointed out that it "found an 8.26 percent difference between their results and Ameritech's published results for Performance Measurement 11."[129] SBC's insistence that this 8.26 percent difference in results is somehow meaningless underscores the inherent risk of accepting at face value SBC's characterizations of the impact of data errors on its reported results. Significantly, although the 8.26 percent difference in performance results presumably would have met E&Y's materiality standard, as SBC's own matrices reveal, E&Y did not address these deficiencies during its audit.[130]

136. **Observation 687 (IL, IN, OH, WI).** In Observation 687, issued on October 23, 2002, BearingPoint found that SBC is improperly excluding certain "Jeopardy and Unsolicited FOCs from the numerator of Performance Measurement 10.4 ('Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices') while including them in the denominator" – an error which skewed SBC's January, February and March 2002 performance results.[131] In Version 2 of Observation 687, issued on November 21, 2002, BearingPoint found that these same data errors also impacted SBC's July, August and September 2002 PM 10.4 results.[132]

[129] BearingPoint Closed Observations Status Report, dated July 29, 2003, Observation 643, at 291.

[130] Ehr/Fioretti Aff., Attach. F at 3, 17.

[131] BearingPoint Observation 687, dated October 23, 2002.

[132] BearingPoint Observation 687, Version 2, dated November 21, 2002.

137. In responding to these findings, SBC conceded that it had improperly applied exclusions in calculating its performance results for Performance Measurement 10.4 and stated that it resolved these problems with updated code. Because Observation 687 does not quantify the impact that these errors had on performance results, it is impossible to know whether these errors would have met E&Y's materiality standard. Importantly, although SBC was improperly applying exclusions in its calculations of Performance Measurement 10.4 during the period covered by E&Y's audit, E&Y's audit reports omit any reference to these infirmities in SBC's data.[133] Furthermore, although SBC asserts that it has resolved this issue with updated code and documentation, this observation remains open because BearingPoint is retesting SBC's data to assess whether these problems have, in fact, been remedied.

138. **Observation 697 (IL, IN, OH, WI).** In Observation 697, issued on November 14, 2002, BearingPoint found that SBC's July, August and September 2002 results for Performance Measurement 1.2 (Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders)[134] do not comply with the published business rules governing the measure because SBC was "overcount[ing] circuits that had a trouble ticket and circuits that had multiple orders, thus resulting is a more favorable result for SBC Ameritech."[135]

[133] *See* Ehr/Fioretti Aff., Attach. F at 3, 24.

[134] As SBC correctly points out, Performance Measurement 1.2 was suspended when Performance Measurement 1.3 was implemented with April 2003 results. Ehr/Fioretti Aff., Attach. F at 27.

[135] BearingPoint Observation 697, dated November 14, 2002.

139. In response to BearingPoint's findings, SBC conceded that it had been "overcounting trouble tickets and circuits that had multiple orders" and had corrected this error commencing with its January 2003 results.[136] SBC also stated that, because these errors are immaterial, it did not restate its performance results. Because no further work could be performed, BearingPoint closed Observation 697.[137] Significantly, in its application, SBC does not state that E&Y chose not to report this defect in its processes because the error was deemed immaterial. Indeed, SBC concedes that E&Y did not identify or address this error during its audit.[138]

140. **Observation 751 (IL)**. In Observation 751, which was issued on December 12, 2002 and which applies to Illinois only, BearingPoint found that SBC's July 2002 results for Performance Measurement 55 (Average Installation Interval) failed to exclude CLEC-caused misses in accordance with the business rules.[139] In response to BearingPoint's findings, SBC confirmed that it was improperly applying exclusions. In apparent recognition that this error is material, SBC noted that it would restate its July results on April 7, 2003.[140] On April 22, 2003, BearingPoint confirmed that SBC did not restate its results for Performance Measurement 55 on April 7, 2003, as promised.[141] On April 29, May 13, May 27, June 10, and

[136] SBC Response to Observation 697, dated February 17, 2003 at 1.

[137] BearingPoint Closed Observations Status Report, dated July 29, 2003, Observation 697, at 333.

[138] Ehr/Fioretti Aff., Attach. F at 2.

[139] BearingPoint Observation 751, dated December 12, 2002.

[140] *See* SBC Response to Observation 751, Version 2, dated March 11, 2003.

[141] BearingPoint Open Observations Status Report dated July 29, 2003, Observation 751, at 60.

July 1, SBC deferred discussion of Observation 751.[142] SBC then agreed to restate its results in July. However, in reviewing the July restatements, BearingPoint found that SBC, once again, failed to restate its results for Performance Measurement 55. During the July 29, 2003, status call, SBC admitted that it did not restate its results and deferred discussion of Observation 751 until August 12. Significantly, this error that SBC deemed to be material is not addressed in E&Y's audit reports.

141. **Observation 792 (IL, IN, OH, WI)**. In Observation 792, BearingPoint found that SBC's performance results for July 2002 failed to comply with the business rules governing Performance Measurement MI 9 (Percentage of Missing FOCs).[143] In this regard, BearingPoint noted that a FOC response can consist of a FOC, an advisory notice (ADV) or reject notice (REJ). However, BearingPoint found that, when calculating the percentage of FOCs missing for revision orders, SBC "is incorrectly comparing only FOCs (positive acknowledgements) and REJs" and failed to compare ADV messages. In responding to this observation, SBC stated that it implemented corrective action to "start comparing 'ADV' messages in addition to FOCs and REJs" commencing with its August 2002 data.[144] SBC's response to this observation suggests that SBC deemed this error to be material since it restated its July 2002 results. BearingPoint is still in the process of testing SBC's data to determine whether it has corrected this data deficiency. Importantly, although SBC apparently failed to

[142] *Id.*

[143] BearingPoint Observation 792, dated January 23, 2003.

[144] SBC Response to Observation 792, dated February 7, 2003.

compare ADV messages during the period covered by the E&Y audit, E&Y did not detect this error during the course of its audit.[145]

142. **Observation 809 (IL, IN, OH, WI).** In Observation 809, opened on February 17, 2003 in the PMR5 test (as well as the PMR4 test), BearingPoint found that SBC's performance data for PMs 10 (Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR) and 11 (Mean Time to Return Rejects) were inaccurate. In this regard, BearingPoint pointed out that the business rules governing these measures state that "[t]he start time used is the date and time the reject is available to MOR and the end time is the date and time the reject notice is sent to the CLEC."[146]

143. However, BearingPoint found that 40 percent of the total mechanized rejection transactions in SBC's July 2002 data had negative durations, thereby indicating that the reject was sent to the CLEC "before it was 'available' to be sent."[147] Noting that it is impossible for a reject transaction to be transmitted to a CLEC "before it is available to be sent (and thus have a negative duration)," BearingPoint observed that SBC's systems lacked "synchronicity between the two applicable time-stamping mechanisms."[148]

[145] *See* Ehr/Fioretti Aff. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*), Attach. F at 6 (discussing Observation 792 and noting that there is no applicable finding in the E&Y reports).

[146] BearingPoint Observation 809, dated February 17, 2003.

[147] *Id.*

[148] *Id.*

144. BearingPoint also found that, although SBC asserted that it addressed this issue by changing transactions with negative durations to "'0' time durations,"[149] this adjustment did not fully resolve the problems and still yielded inaccuracies in results. Additionally, BearingPoint found that the lack of synchronicity between the time-stamping mechanisms not only generated negative durations, but also likely caused "other 'positive' durations [to] appear shorter than their actual length."[150]

145. In responding to BearingPoint's findings, SBC asserted that, commencing in July 2002, it "re-synchronized the system to ensure the accurate capture of start and end times for mechanized rejects," but decided that it would not restate its performance results because it determined that the data issue was immaterial and "because the exact difference cannot be calculated."[151] Noting that "setting negative durations to have '0' time intervals does not accurately reflect results for Performance Measurements 10 and 11," and that SBC would not "change the calculation to adhere to the July published metrics business rules," BearingPoint closed the observation because "no further work" could be performed.[152]

146. Since SBC admittedly first resynchronized its system in July 2002 to purportedly capture accurate start and end times for mechanized rejects, this synchronicity

[149] *Id.*

[150] *Id.*

[151] SBC Response to Observation 809, dated March 17, 2003 at 2.

[152] BearingPoint Closed Observations Status Report, dated July 29, 2003, Observation 809, at 407.

problem should have been uncovered by E&Y during its audit. However, the E&Y audit reports do not address these defects in SBC's data, as SBC's own analysis shows.[153]

147. **Observation 823 (IL, IN, OH, WI).** In Observation 823, opened on March 26, 2003, BearingPoint found discrepancies in SBC's July and August 2002 results for PMs 10 and 11. BearingPoint pointed out that, according to the published business rules, the volumes reported in the denominators for these measures should be the same (*i.e.* total mechanized rejects). BearingPoint also noted that SBC conceded, in its response to Observation 584, that "[t]he CLEC community expects the volumes reported in Performance Measurement 11 to be the same as the volumes reported in Performance Measurement 10", and that "[a]ny variance would cause concern and raise questions from the CLECs."[154] However, BearingPoint observed that the denominators for PMs 10 and 11 were different in SBC's July and August 2002 performance results.[155]

148. SBC's performance data reported from September 2002 to March 2003 show that the denominators for PMs 10 and 11 have been different each month:

[153] *See* Ehr/Fioretti Supp. Aff., Attach. F at 3, 47.

[154] Observation 823, dated March 26, 2003.

[155] For example, SBC's results for Illinois in July 2002 reported a denominator of 42,240 for PM 10, but a denominator of 40,066 for PM 11. SBC's results for Indiana in July 2002 reported a denominator of 7,099 for PM 10, and a denominator of 6,049 for PM 11. SBC's results for Ohio in July 2002 reported a value of 17,367 for PM 10, but a denominator of 15,732 for PM 11. SBC's results for Wisconsin in July 2002 reported a denominator of 10,777 for PM 10, but a denominator of 10,366 for PM 11. *Id.*

Table 5

Percent Mechanized Rejects Reported in SBC's Denominators[156]

	Indiana		Illinois		Ohio		Wisconsin	
	PM 10	**PM 11**	**PM 10**	**PM 11**	**PM 10**	**PM 11**	**PM 10**	**PM 11**
Sept. 02	7,015	6,084	43,599	39,643	18,951	17,382	12,412	11,152
Oct. 02	7,383	5,873	53,487	47,078	25,216	23,348	10,464	8,995
Nov. 02	7,091	6,152	45,811	42,275	22,636	21,035	10,012	8,722
Dec. 02	7,290	6,084	38,634	34,347	18,066	16,064	8,150	7,011
Jan. 03	7,422	6,419	40,627	35,039	18,668	16,031	9,087	7,933
Feb. 03	7,224	6,225	34,555	29,784	17,368	14,884	8,653	7,760
Mar. 03	14,382	12,938	32,609	27,379	17,557	15,015	8,908	7,670

149. In its response to Observation 823, SBC admitted that it had improperly excluded auto/man rejects when calculating its performance results for LSOG 5 orders. SBC further stated that, starting with its August 2002 data, it corrected its improper exclusion of auto/man rejects in Performance Measurement 10 for LSOG 5 orders. However, SBC also admitted that it did not implement corrective steps to fix the defects in its Performance Measurement 11 data, and that it plans to correct its Performance Measurement 11 business rule implementation commencing with its April 2003 results. Indeed, SBC conceded that Performance Measurement 10 includes auto/auto and auto/man rejects, while Performance Measurement 11 includes only auto/auto rejects. Accordingly, because SBC, by its own admission, has improperly excluded auto/man rejects when calculating its results for Performance Measurement 11, SBC's reported data for Performance Measurement 11 (prior to its April 2003 results) are inaccurate.

[156] Ehr (Indiana) Aff., Attach. C; Ehr (Illinois) Aff., Attach. C; Ehr (Ohio) Aff., Attach. C; Ehr (Wisconsin) Aff., Attach. C.

150. Importantly, although E&Y found that SBC was improperly excluding auto/man rejects in Performance Measurement 10 for LSOG 5 orders, it *did not* uncover that SBC was improperly excluding auto/man rejects in Performance Measurement 11. Indeed, SBC has admitted that E&Y's audit addressed only Performance Measurement 10.[157] Moreover, as the following tables show, the volumes reported in the denominators of PMs 10 and 11 did not match in SBC's April and May 2002 results which E&Y evaluated during the course of its audit:[158]

Table 6

	Indiana		Illinois		Ohio		Wisconsin	
	PM 10	**PM 11**	**PM 10**	**PM 11**	**PM 10**	**PM 11**	**PM 10**	**PM 11**
Apr. 02	36,254	35,640	5,845	5,585	13,802	13,502	7,966	8,125
May 02	47,418	44,119	8,510	7,528	17,459	15,928	11,552	11,079

151. Significantly, the E&Y audit reports do not address these discrepancies or the fact that SBC was improperly excluding auto/man rejects in calculating results for Performance Measurement 11. E&Y's failure to detect these deficiencies in SBC's processes provides further confirmation of the inherent unreliability of the E&Y audit.

152. **Observation 856 (IL, IN, OH, WI)**. SBC has conceded that Performance Measurement 1.2 (Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders) is a key measure.[159] However, in Observation 856, issued on June 12, 2003 in the PMR5 test, BearingPoint found that SBC's "technical documentation for Performance Measurement 1.2

[157] Ehr/Fioretti Aff., Attach. F at 49 (noting that E&Y addressed the issue regarding PM 10 in Section I #17).

[158] SBC's CLEC aggregate performance results for April and May 2002 are reported on its website.

includes a technical error that results in improper calculation of the performance measurement" in its July, August, and September 2002 results.[160]

153. In explaining the basis for its finding, BearingPoint noted that SBC used two data sources to obtain the data to calculate its performance results for Performance Measure 1.2 (*i.e.* the Facilities Modification (FMOD) database and WFA reports). BearingPoint observed that, in its efforts to count the number of manual loop makeup queries, SBC attempts to match the "'Report Number' in the WFA reports with the 'Order Number' in the FMOD database."[161] However, BearingPoint found that SBC's comparison of FMOD records to WFA reports "is inappropriate given that the WFA 'Report Number' is the trouble ticket number generated when the trouble ticket was called in, and the FMOD 'Order Number' is the Service Order Number generated when the provisioning order was accepted."[162] Because the data elements in the two data sources "will never be the same," BearingPoint found that SBC "is effectively not reporting its performance on Loop Makeup information provided manually, which is one of the specified disaggregations."[163]

154. In response to BearingPoint's findings, SBC stated that it corrected its technical documentation which erroneously excluded manual loop makeup queries from its

---

(footnote continued from previous page)
[159] *See* SBC July 10 *Ex Parte*, Attach. Dv2 at 2.

[160] BearingPoint Observation 856, dated June 12, 2003 (footnote omitted).

[161] *Id.*

[162] *Id.*

[163] *Id.*

calculation of Performance Measure 1.2.[164] SBC further stated that restatement was unnecessary because "there were no Loop Makeup orders during" July, August and September 2002.[165]

155. Notwithstanding SBC's response, this observation remains open. Noting the corrections to the technical documentation that SBC made ostensibly to correct this error, BearingPoint has asked SBC to provide additional information to explain precisely how its revisions somehow address BearingPoint's concerns.[166] Furthermore, BearingPoint also has found that SBC's assertion regarding the absence of Loop Makeup orders during the relevant period contradicts SBC's reported data for CLEC WI 7 (which report such orders) during the relevant period.

156. AT&T has no way of knowing whether there were manual Loop Makeup Information requests during the period covered by the E&Y audit. If there were manual Loop Makeup queries during the period covered by E&Y's audit, it is clear that SBC excluded such data from its performance results for Performance Measurement 1.2. Whether such an error would have met E&Y's materiality standard is unclear. In all events, E&Y's audit reports omit any reference to the defects identified in BearingPoint Observation 856.

157. **Observation 859 (IL, IN, OH).** In Observation 859, issued on June 12, 2003, BearingPoint found that SBC, in its July, August and September 2002 results, is

[164] SBC Response to Observation 856, dated June 24, 2003.

[165] *Id.*

[166] BearingPoint Additional Information Document, Observation 856, dated July 10, 2003.

incorrectly "calculating the Manual UNE disaggregation of Performance Measurement MI 14 [Percent Completion Notifications Returned within 'X' Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket] by counting tickets with blank notification dates as being returned by the next day."[167] BearingPoint also observed that, because the notification dates on these tickets are blank, SBC cannot assess whether these trouble tickets satisfied the timeliness standard of Performance Measurement MI 14.

158. In its response to Observation 859, SBC conceded that it was improperly calculating the measure and that it incorrectly counted UNE Loop trouble reports with blank notification times as transactions that met the timeliness standard of Performance Measurement MI 14.[168] SBC also stated that, effective with its June 2003 results, it will start capturing such transactions as a "miss" in its performance results. Critically, because SBC, by its own admission, will not have corrected this error until its June 2003 data reported on July 21, 2003, SBC must have made this same error during the period covered by the E&Y audit. However, the E&Y audit reports do not address these business rule errors that BearingPoint found.[169] Because BearingPoint has not quantified the impact of these errors, it is impossible to know whether these errors would have met E&Y's materiality standard.

[167] BearingPoint Observation 859, dated June 12, 2003.

[168] *See* SBC Response to Observation 859, dated June 24, 2003 (admitting that "SBC currently defaults closed UNE Loop trouble reports not having a clearly defined Customer Advised or notification date as being included in the numerator and denominator of PM MI 14.")

[169] *See* SBC July 10 *Ex Parte*, Attach. Fv2 at 6.

159. **Observation 864 (IL, IN, OH, WI)**. As noted above, in Observation 864, issued on June 27, 2003, BearingPoint found that SBC's July, August and September 2002 results for Performance Measurement 18 (Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)) do not adhere to the published business rules because SBC fails to use the actual date of transmission when calculating performance results.[170] Although SBC, in its response to this observation, has stated that this error is not material under its own restatement policy,[171] given SBC's ever-shifting definitions of materiality, any claims that SBC makes regarding the impact of errors on its performance results should not be credited. Because SBC has admitted that a process change must be implemented to correct this defect in its data,[172] SBC must have implemented Performance Measurement 18 improperly during the time period covered by the E&Y audit. The E&Y audit reports, however, do not address the process errors that BearingPoint identified in Observation 864. Because Observation 864 does not quantify the impact of these errors on performance results, it is impossible to know whether these errors would have met E&Y's materiality standard.

160. **Observation 866 (IL, IN, OH, WI)**. In Observation 866, issued on June 27, 2003, BearingPoint found that SBC is improperly excluding revisions to orders when calculating its Resale and LNP results for July and August 2002 and LSNP results for July, August, and September 2002 for Performance Measurements 13 (Order Process Percent Flow

[170] BearingPoint Observation 864, dated June 27, 2003.

[171] SBC Response to Observation 864, dated July 8, 2003.

[172] *Id.*

Through) and 13.1 (Total Order Process Percent Flow Through).[173] In responding to another observation (*i.e.* Observation 488), SBC asserted that, "[u]ntil the August 2002 OSS Release, revisions for only Resale and UNE-P for due date changes and cancellations were designed to flow through as long as the Original Request was flow through eligible."[174] In Observation 866, BearingPoint found that SBC improperly excluded revisions to Resale orders when calculating its performance results for Performance Measures 13 and 13.1 Because Observation 866 does not quantify the precise impact that these improper exclusions had on performance results, it is unclear whether these data errors would have been deemed material by E&Y. Significantly, although E&Y found that SBC was incorrectly excluding revisions to UNE Loops and LNP orders when calculating its performance results for these measures, it failed to detect, as BearingPoint found, that this improper exclusion impacted the calculation of the Resale and LSNP disaggregations.[175]

161. **Observation 871 (IL, IN, OH, WI)**. As noted above, in Observation 871, BearingPoint found that SBC is improperly using a random sample of bills instead of all bills when calculating its results for Performance Measurement 15 (Percent of Accurate and Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills Via EDI or BDT). Although SBC's EDI performance data for Performance Measurement 15 that E&Y examined during its audit presumably were based upon

[173] BearingPoint Observation 866, dated June 27, 2003.

[174] *See* Ehr/Fioretti Aff. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*), Attach. F at 8; SBC Response to Additional Information, Observation 488, dated September 20, 2002.

[175] *See id.* (noting that E&Y addressed issues regarding revisions to orders for UNE Loops and LNP in Section IV, #8.)

a random sample, E&Y's reports do not identify this business rule error.[176] Because BearingPoint's observation does not quantify the effect of this error on performance results, it is impossible to assess whether this error would have satisfied E&Y's materiality standard.

162. **Observations 872 and 873 (IL, IN, OH, WI)**. BearingPoint has uncovered other errors in SBC's implementation of the business rules that E&Y failed to uncover. In Observation 872 issued on July 7, 2003, BearingPoint found that SBC is incorrectly "excluding circuits associated with early and delayed Coordinated Hot Cut (CHC) orders in the count of the total number of circuits converted for the CHC denominator of Performance Measurement 115.1 [Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR)]."[177] Similarly, in Observation 873, issued on July 9, 2003, BearingPoint found that SBC was improperly excluding from Performance Measurement 115.1 "trouble reports submitted after noon on the next *calendar* day [instead of on the next business day] following conversion."[178] Although SBC was apparently applying these same improper exclusions during the period covered by the E&Y audit, the E&Y audit reports omit any reference to these errors.[179] Because Observations 872

[176] Dolan/Horst Aff. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I*), Attach. B, E&Y October 18, 2002 Audit Report, Attach. A, Sect. III, Issue 7. With respect to Performance Measurement 15, E&Y found that SBC "did not have a process in place to accurately capture and report when a totaling, formatting, content, or syntax error was detected during the resale bill audit process." E&Y also accepted SBC's interpretation of the business rules to include bills transmitted "by means other than EDI and BDT in the PM result." *Id.*, Attach. B – Interpretations, Issue 10.

[177] BearingPoint Observation 872, dated July 7, 2003.

[178] BearingPoint Observation 873, dated July 9, 2003 (emphasis in original).

[179] In examining the data for Performance Measurement 115.1, E&Y noted that SBC was excluding "non-measured trouble reports" (*i.e.*, CPE, Interexchange, and INF code troubles) and was not excluding troubles that were attributable to SBC's network. Dolan/Horst Aff. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I)*, Attach. B, E&Y October 18, 2002 Audit Report, Attach. B-Interpretations, Issue 34. E&Y also found that SBC was excluding orders with more than 24 lines. *Id.*, Issue 33.

and 873 do not quantify the precise impact that these improper exclusions had on performance results, it is impossible to discern if these errors would have met E&Y's materiality standard.

163. **Observations 874 and 875 (IL, IN, OH, WI)**. In these observations issued on July 9, 2003, BearingPoint found that SBC is incorrectly "excluding provisioning trouble reports associated with early and delayed Coordinated Hot Cuts,"[180] as well as "provisioning trouble reports for troubles that occur later than noon on the day following the conversion"[181] when calculating results for Performance Measurement 115.2 (Mean Time to Restore – Provisioning Trouble Report (PTR)) for July, August and September 2002. These business rule errors are nowhere mentioned in E&Y's audit reports. Because the BearingPoint observations do not quantify the impact of these errors on performance results, it is impossible to determine whether these errors would have met E&Y's materiality standard.

164. **Observation 876 (IL, IN, OH, WI)**. In Observation 876, issued on July 9, 2003, BearingPoint found that it could not replicate SBC's July, August and September 2002 results for Performance Measurement MI 14 (Percent Completion Notifications Return Within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Tickets). This observation reveals significant differences between the values reported by SBC and BearingPoint.

165. For example, the defects identified in Observation 876 also apply to Michigan. With respect to SBC's July 2002 results for Michigan, BearingPoint reported values of 85 for the numerator and 86 for the denominator (or approximately 99%), while SBC reported

[180] BearingPoint Observation 874, dated July 9, 2003.

values of 159 for the numerator and 160 for the denominator (or approximately 99%). Thus, the values that SBC reported are almost twice as high as those reported by BearingPoint. In its response to Observation 876, SBC admitted that the "data file which was used for the July posted results contained missing data for some days and duplicate data for other days."[182] Notably, the type of error reflected in Observation 876 would not have been reported by E&Y because it would have been considered immaterial. In this regard, although the values reported by SBC and the auditor widely vary, E&Y would not have reported this error because the overall performance results reported by both the auditor and SBC (approximately 99%) were the same (and did not deviate by five percent or more).[183] These defects in SBC's data which are the subject of Observation 876 further illustrate the inherent risk of relying on the E&Y audit which employed a flawed materiality standard that necessarily resulted in the concealment of errors in SBC's data.

166. **Observation 878 (IL, IN, OH, WI).** In Observation 878, issued on July 16, 2003, BearingPoint found that SBC incorrectly calculated its July, August and September 2002 results for "Performance Measurement MI 3 by counting the number of orders in the numerator and denominator rather than counting the number of loops per order as is specified in the published metrics business rules."[184] Because Observation 878 does not quantify the impact

---

(footnote continued from previous page)
[181] BearingPoint Observation 875, dated July 9, 2003.

[182] SBC Response to Observation 876, dated July 14, 2003 at 2.

[183] Observation 876 also identifies non-matching values in some of SBC's results for Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Wisconsin.

[184] BearingPoint Observation 878, dated July 16, 2003.

of this error on performance results, it is impossible to know whether this error would have met E&Y's materiality standard. In all events, the E&Y audit reports do not address this data defect.

167. **Observation 880 (IL, IN, OH, WI)**. In Observation 880, issued on July 17, 2003, BearingPoint found that, in calculating its July, August and September 2002 results for Performance Measurements 114 (Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers), 114.1 (CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval), 115 (Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers) and MI 3 (Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval), SBC improperly excludes from the denominator Coordinated Hot Orders that commence 10 minutes before or 30 minutes after the scheduled time.[185] Because Observation 880 does not quantify the impact of these errors on performance results, it is impossible to know whether these errors would have met E&Y's materiality standard. Notably, E&Y's audit reports do not address these business rule implementation deficiencies.[186]

[185] BearingPoint Observation 880, dated July 17, 2003.

[186] In its Application SBC addresses the observations that BearingPoint has issued through Observation 870. However, BearingPoint has issued additional observations since SBC completed its analysis for its four-State application. Thus, for example, BearingPoint issued Observation 872 (IL, IN, OH, WI) on July 7, 2003, finding that SBC is incorrectly applying exclusions when calculating its July, August and September 2002 results for Performance Measurement 115.1 (Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports (PTR)). BearingPoint issued Observation 874 (IL, IN, OH, WI) on July 9, 2003, finding that SBC is incorrectly applying exclusions when calculating its July, August, and September 2002 results for Performance Measurement 115.2 (Mean Time to Restore-Provisioning trouble Report (PTR)). BearingPoint also issued Observation 876 (IL, IN, OH, WI) on July 9, 2003, finding that it could not replicate SBC's July, August and September 2002 results for Performance Measurement MI 14(Percent Completion Notifications Returned Within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Ticket). On July 17, 2003, BearingPoint issued Observation 880 (IL, IN, OH, WI), finding that SBC is incorrectly applying exclusions in its July, August and September 2002 results when calculating its results for Performance Measurements 114 (Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers); 114.1 (CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval); 115 (Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers) and MI 3 (Coordination Conversions Outside of Interval). On July 28, 2003,

(footnote continued on next page)

III. THE COMMISSION SHOULD REJECT SBC'S EVER-CHANGING MATERIALITY STANDARDS.

168. The sheer volume and nature of SBC's restatements demonstrate the instability and unreliability of its performance monitoring and reporting processes. As AT&T pointed out in connection with SBC's Michigan 271 application, from May 2002 through March 2003, SBC restated data for 1,063 measures.[187] Furthermore, a number of measures have been restated for multiple reasons. From May 2002 through February 2003, SBC has issued 1,816 restatements to its performance data.[188] SBC continues to restate its performance results for the July to September 2002 period – more than a full year *after* those results were originally published in error.

169. In an effort to diminish the importance of these restatements, SBC, during the *Michigan 271 Proceeding*, contended that the material rate of restatement, rather than the sheer number of restatements, was of critical importance. SBC further asserted that, when viewed in that context, SBC's material rate of restatement is less than 1% of its reported results.

(footnote continued from previous page)
BearingPoint issued Observation 881, finding that SBC's July, August and September 2002 results for Performance Measurement 66 (Percentage Missed Repair Contracts) do not follow the published business rules because "[f]or the 8 db Loop Retail equivalent . . . SBC Ameritech counts trouble reports as missed repair commitments, even if the cleared date and time minus the commitment date and time is less than 24 hours." Additionally, in Observation 882 (IL, IN, OH, WI), issued on July 30, 2003, BearingPoint found that it could not replicate SBC's July 2002 results for Performance Measurement 10.4 (Percentage of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices).

[187] Moore/Connolly/Norris Reply Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I*) ¶ 105.

[188] *Id.* ¶ 106.

170. In commenting on SBC's initial and supplemental 271 Michigan applications, AT&T explained that SBC had relied upon different criteria for determining the materiality of errors for purposes of restatement.[189] AT&T also explained that SBC's purported guidelines for restatement posted on its website are fundamentally flawed because they necessarily shield from public scrutiny errors in its reported results. As AT&T noted, because of such concerns, the Public Utility Commission in Florida recently eliminated the 100-transaction threshold in BellSouth's restatement policy – the same transaction threshold in SBC's restatement guidelines. Indeed, because of the 100 transaction limitation, errors in reported results for important measures that traditionally have fewer than 100 transactions (*e.g.* collocation metrics) would never be restated. AT&T also explained that, because of SBC's ever-shifting conditions for determining the materiality of errors warranting restatement, this Commission should not credit any claims that SBC makes regarding the purported impact of errors on its performance results.[190]

171. In its Four-State Application, SBC responds to AT&T's Michigan 271 arguments and insists that it has never changed its restatement guidelines. In this regard, SBC asserts that the materiality criteria that it cited in its first Michigan 271 application reveal "that the materiality criteria employed there merely contributed to the analysis of restatements already made, relative to BearingPoint's Exception 20, and was not to advance criteria for determining

[189] Moore/Connolly Reply Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) ¶¶ 48-53.
[190] *Id.* ¶ 53.

whether previously reported performance data might be 'worthy of restatement.'"[191] SBC's arguments border on the frivolous.

172. In both SBC's initial and supplemental Michigan applications, SBC, in an effort to rationalize the number of restatements it has made, stated that SBC has restated results – even when there was no material change to prior results – to "facilitate BearingPoint's" testing.[192] In both the initial and supplemental Michigan applications, SBC stated that the Commission should properly focus on the materiality of restatements, rather than the number of restatements.[193] In both the initial and supplemental applications, SBC stated that, based upon the materiality of restatements, rather than the number of restatements, its restatement rate is "less than 1% of" its reported results.[194]

173. Furthermore, in an attempt to bolster its claim that its material rate of restatement is less than 1% of its previously reported results, SBC, in both the initial and supplemental applications, described the criteria for determining materiality. In the initial application, SBC stated that "[f]or this analysis, materiality is determined by the individual submeasure results moving from (a) 'pass' to 'fail'; (b) 'fail' to 'pass'; (c) 'indeterminate/no data' (no test possible) to 'fail'; or (d) 'fail' to 'indeterminate/no data'."[195]

---

[191] Ehr (Wisconsin) Aff. ¶ 207 (emphasis in original).

[192] Ehr Reply Aff. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I*) ¶ 49; Ehr Supp. Aff. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) ¶ 85.

[193] *Id.*

[194] *Id.* (emphasis added).

[195] Ehr Reply Aff. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I*) ¶ 49.

174. In its supplemental Michigan application, however, SBC stated that "[a]n assessment of materiality is based on whether the recalculated data would result (a) in a shift in the performance in the aggregation from a 'make' to a 'miss' condition or (b) in a further degradation of reported performance of more than 5% for measures that are in a 'miss' condition, provided there are at least 100 CLEC transactions in the sub-metric."[196] SBC also asserted that its restatement policy is on its website.

175. Thus, in both the initial and supplemental Michigan 271 applications, SBC, in dismissing the number of restatements purportedly made to address BearingPoint's testing, stated that the materiality of the potential restatement is of critical importance. And the fact remains that, in both the initial and supplemental applications, SBC referred to two different standards for determining materiality in the context of restatements.[197]

176. Notably, SBC does not deny that it failed to disclose to the Commission in its initial Michigan 271 application that it uses a materiality standard that is different from that referenced in its initial application and which it finally disclosed in its supplemental Michigan application. Critically, SBC does not deny that it unilaterally adopted the materiality standard referenced in its supplemental application.

[196] Ehr Supp. Aff. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) ¶ 85.

[197] *See* Ehr/Fioretti Aff. ¶ 82 nn. 39, 40 (referring to the materiality standard SBC uses in its SBC Midwest restatement guidelines and admitting that, "[i]n the Ehr (Michigan) Reply Affidavit, SBC used "a different set of criteria.")

177. SBC has not only changed its materiality standard whenever it suits its purpose, but it has also implemented ill-conceived conditions for restatement that permit SBC to mask errors in its performance results.[198] Worse yet, in a letter to AT&T dated July 15, 2003 on backbilling and billing reconciliation, SBC unveiled yet another set of misguided criteria that it imposes in determining the materiality of errors warranting restatement – conditions that demonstrate that SBC's so-called standard on materiality is actually standardless.

178. In a letter dated July 15, 2003, SBC amplified the basis for its refusal to restate its performance data for Performance Measurement 17.[199] After noting that SBC had repeatedly failed the parity standard for Performance Measurement 17, SBC indicated that restatement of its prior erroneous performance results is unnecessary because CLECs are already "aware" of SBC's substandard performance:

> Notably, SBC's PM 17 results during the course of 2002 (missing parity 11 months in Michigan; 5 months in Wisconsin; 12 months in Illinois; 7 months in Indiana and 9 months in Ohio) demonstrate that the impact of the CABS conversion effort was reflected in the measure. *Given that CLECs have long been aware of SBC's deficient performance on this measure, there seems little to be gained even if the results could be restated or estimated to include cancelled service orders.*[200]

179. SBC's response is nothing short of remarkable. SBC essentially maintains that it has no obligation to correct previously issued, error-ridden performance results if CLECs

[198] *See* Moore/Connolly Reply Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) ¶¶ 48-53.

[199] Letter from Thomas Harvey to Sarah DeYoung, dated July 15, 2003 at 2, attached as Attachment 3 to the Moore/Connolly Reply Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*).

[200] *Id.* at 2 (emphasis added).

are generally "aware" that SBC's performance has been subpar. SBC's position is plainly untenable. Clearly, this Commission, state regulatory bodies, and the CLECs cannot conduct a comprehensive analysis of SBC's actual performance if SBC posts inaccurate performance data which remain uncorrected. Moreover, SBC cannot and should not be permitted to escape its obligation to produce accurate and complete performance reports simply because it believes that CLECs are generally aware that its performance has been subpar on a given measure. This Commission, CLECs and state regulators are entitled to receive restated performance data correcting prior reports – even if the restated results show that SBC's performance is even far worse than its prior, abysmal and erroneous results indicated.

180. In further rationalizing its refusal to restate its performance data, SBC, in its July 15 letter, also indicated that restatement of its results for Performance Measurement 17 is not warranted because SBC has already "reached the cap provided for under the performance remedy plan for both AT&T and TCG."[201] This rationalization is equally specious. The remedy plan includes no provision that permits SBC to shield errors in its performance results whenever SBC reaches the penalty cap. SBC's position is otherwise untenable because it effectively permits SBC to conceal errors in its performance data and mask the actual depths of its albeit, deplorable performance.

181. Thus, at bottom, SBC's so-called materiality standard is, in reality, a standardless approach. Moreover, SBC's ever-changing materiality standard governing restatement shows that: (1) SBC's purported commitment to accuracy in its performance results

is disingenuous; (2) this Commission should not accept at face value any assertion that SBC makes regarding the impact of errors on its performance results; and (3) even the carrot of Section 271 approval has not proven to be a sufficient incentive for SBC to provide accurate performance reports.

IV. SBC HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT ITS BILLING DATA ARE ACCURATE.

182. As part of its OSS obligations under the Act and the competitive checklist, SBC is required to "provide nondiscriminatory access to its billing functions, which is necessary to enable competing carriers to provide accurate and timely bills to their customers."[202] Indeed, "[t]he Commission has held that BOCs must provide CLECs with 'two essential billing functions: (i) complete, accurate and timely reports on the service usage of [their] customers and (ii) complete, accurate and timely wholesale bills.'"[203]

183. There are substantial defects in SBC's billing systems that spawn inaccuracies in its wholesale bills and usage records.[204] As the Department of Justice observed during its evaluation of SBC's Michigan 271 application, "the CLECs make credible allegations that they are continuing to receive wholesale bills for SBC that contain substantial inaccuracies,"

(footnote continued from previous page)
[201] *Id.*

[202] *Qwest Nine-State 271 Order,* Appendix K, ¶ 39.

[203] DOJ Eval. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) at 6.

[204] *See, e.g.* DOJ Eval. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) at 4-9; MCI Lichtenberg Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) ¶ 18; DeYoung/Tavares Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) ¶¶ 7-12; TDS Metrocom Cox Aff. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) ¶ 7-31; DeYoung/Tavares Reply Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) ¶¶ 3-17.

and "SBC does not offer any objective measure to demonstrate that its actual billing performance is improving."[205] Importantly, because the pool of evidence confirms the existence of fundamental infirmities in SBC's billing systems, the Department of Justice has concluded that it "is not in a position to support [SBC's Michigan 271] application based on the current record."[206]

184. Moreover, SBC cannot properly rely on its commercial billing data as proof that its billing data are accurate, timely and complete. In this regard, in order to provide meaningful information on the issue of whether nondiscriminatory access is being provided, performance measurements should be defined clearly and implemented properly.[207] Further, performance measurements should not be subject to unilateral redefinition or manipulation by the BOC. The performance measures should measure all transactions during the reporting period, include an accurate and complete description of the data used to calculate performance results, describe business rules, reference all data excluded from calculations, define all relevant terms, set forth the formula for calculating metrics results, and ensure that the measurements are sufficiently disaggregated so that "like-to-like" comparisons can be made. Because SBC is relying on its self-reported performance data to establish that it has fully satisfied its Section 271

[205] DOJ Eval. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) at 7 (footnote omitted).

[206] *Id.* at 2.

[207] *Michigan 271 Order* ¶ 212 (noting that the BOC must "ensure that its performance measurements are clearly defined"); ¶ 209 (a BOC cannot rely on performance measurements which are not "clearly explained").

obligations, SBC also bears the burden of establishing that its performance data are accurate.[208] SBC has not satisfied and cannot satisfy this basic test.

185. As the Department of Justice has observed during its evaluation of SBC's Michigan 271 application, "the relevant Michigan performance metrics have limited utility in catching a wide range of potential billing errors; the most relevant metric, MI [sic] 14, is designed to determine whether bills are correctly being calculated according to SBC's billing tables, not whether the underlying information about the lines themselves is accurate."[209] Indeed, even E&Y conceded during hearings that Performance Measurement 14 does not adequately capture billing errors and problems.[210] Thus, SBC cannot reasonably rely on its commercial performance data to prove that it has provided nondiscriminatory access to its billing functions since its billing performance measurements do not completely and accurately capture SBC's actual performance in this area.[211]

186. The BearingPoint performance metrics audit provides further confirmation that SBC's billing data are untrustworthy. As discussed above, in Version 5 of Exception 187

[208] *BellSouth South Carolina 271 Order* ¶ 37 ("the BOC applicant retains at all times the ultimate burden of proof that its application is sufficient") (footnote omitted).

[209] DOJ Eval. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) at 9 n. 44.

[210] *See* Wisconsin Hearing Transcript, March 11, 2003 at 301-307, attached as Attachment 8.

[211] Other performance measures on which SBC relies do not accurately capture its actual performance. For example, as explained in the DeYoung/Willard Declaration, SBC's loop provisioning processes are deficient for new UNE-P installations and lead to unproductive truck rolls. However, SBC's performance results for Performance Measurement 28 do not accurately capture all instances where SBC failed to deliver a working loop on the date the SOC was issued.

issued on July 11, 2003, BearingPoint found that SBC's calculation logic underlying its reported results for Performance Measurement 18 (Billing Timeliness) – a key measure – is inaccurate. Although SBC in its application attempts to minimize the significance of these defects in its step-by-step logic, it is beyond dispute that such inaccuracies in SBC's technical documentation can generate errors in its reported data.

187. Similarly, in Observation 864, issued on June 27, 2003, BearingPoint found that SBC's reported results for July, August and September 2002 for Performance Measurement 18 do not comply with the published business rules because SBC incorrectly uses the scheduled date of billing data transmission, instead of the actual date of transmission, when calculating its results.[212] In its response to Observation 864, SBC admitted these data errors and stated that it "will implement a process change to gather data for the reporting period using the transmission date for the AEBS disaggregation of Performance Measure 18."[213] According to BearingPoint's Closed Observation Status Report issued on July 29, 2003, Bearing Point has now closed Observation 864 as "Not Satisfied" for the following reason:

> BearingPoint proposed to close this observation. BearingPoint reported that in SBC Ameritech's July 8, 2003 response stated that SBC would implement a process change for PM 18 via ER 871-0703. As of 12/01/03,. SBC Ameritech will gather data for the reporting period for the AEBS disaggregation of PM 18 using the actual transmission date. However, SBC Ameritech is using the transmission due date to gather data for the reporting period for the July, August,

[212] BearingPoint Observation 864, dated June 27, 2003.

[213] SBC Response to Observation 864, dated July 8, 2003.

> and September data months and has no plans to restate results for those months. No further work can be performed by BearingPoint at this time.[214]

188. BearingPoint has found other errors in SBC's billing data. In Observation 871 issued on July 2, 2003. BearingPoint found that SBC's July, August and September 2002 performance data for Performance Measurement 15 (Percent of Accurate and Complete Formatted Mechanized Bills via EDI or BDT) do not comply with the business rules because SBC is using a *sample* of bills rather than total bills when calculating its performance results. Noting that the business rules provide that the denominator of the calculation formula for Performance Measure 15 should consist of "total bills," BearingPoint found that SBC's "use of a random sample results in the non-reporting of results for CLECs whose bills were not a part of the sample population."[215]

189. In response to BearingPoint's findings, SBC has asserted that, in calculating its results for bills issued via BDT, it "reports results for every bill."[216] However, SBC also conceded that its EDI reported results are based upon a sample of bills, and that it plans to "implement a process change for the EDI disaggregation of Performance Measurement 15 to capture and report results based upon the total number of CLEC bills rather than a sample."[217] SBC further asserted that, based upon its own materiality assessment, restatement is

[214] BearingPoint Closed Observations Status Report, Observation 864, dated July 29, 2003 at 439.

[215] BearingPoint Observation 871, dated July 2, 2003.

[216] SBC Response to Observation 871, dated July 17, 2003 at 1.

[217] *Id.*

not warranted.[218] However, given SBC's materiality standard – which is tantamount to shifting sand and which is discussed in more detail below – SBC's partisan, self-assessment on materiality simply should not be credited. According to the most recent BearingPoint Closed Observations Status Report, BearingPoint has now closed Observation 871 because SBC has not yet implemented corrective action to resolve these issues and will not restate its results:

> BearingPoint proposed to close this observation. SBC Ameritech's July 17, 2003 response indicates that it is calculating the EDI disaggregation of PM 15 for July, August and September 2002 by reporting based on a sample set of bills instead of reporting on all bills. According to SBC Ameritech's July 17, 2003 response a process change for the EDI disaggregation of PM 15 to capture and report results based upon the total number of CLEC bills will be implemented, however, the July, August and September 2002 results will not be restated. No further work can be performed by BearingPoint at this time.[219]

190. It must also be emphasized that BearingPoint's testing, which is far from complete, may uncover other defects in SBC's billing data. Based upon the current record, there is no sound basis for a finding that SBC's billing data are accurate and show statutory compliance. Any such notion is belied by the actual commercial billing experiences and the ongoing BearingPoint PMR test which together demonstrate that SBC's billing systems are error-ridden and have generated and continue to generate inaccuracies in performance results. Indeed, the Public Service Commission of Wisconsin is sufficiently concerned about the

[218] *Id.*

[219] BearingPoint Closed Observations Status Report, Observation 871, dated July 29, 2003 at 441.

complaints raised by CLECs during the State 271 proceeding that it has opened, on its own motion, an investigation into the wholesale billing practices of SBC Wisconsin.[220]

V. SBC'S ARGUMENTS ON ACCESS TO RAW DATA RING HOLLOW.

191. SBC contends that its provision of the raw data underlying its performance results to the CLECs constitutes other indicia of the reliability of its data.[221] In lending color to this assertion, SBC states that:

> The provision of raw data to a CLEC is typically an informal "business-to-business" process that is precipitated by the CLEC's request for raw data for certain months and certain measurements. For example, each of the BOC applicants has been providing raw data pursuant to one CLEC's standing request for several measurements for over a year. . . . Beginning in the first quarter of 2003, the BOC applicants began providing CLECs access to raw data for their PM results via the CLEC OnLine Internet web site. Currently, they provide raw data for 87 measures via this web site and expect that data for the remaining measures will be made available over the coming months. Typically, the BOC applicants process the requested data and make it available within a day.[222]

192. Despite SBC's contrary claims, in the past, SBC has not provided AT&T with raw data underlying its request "within a day" after AT&T's request. Indeed, although SBC contends that it "typically" processes requests for raw data within a day after the CLEC's request, AT&T pointed out in the *Michigan 271 Proceeding* that SBC has, on any number of

[220] Notice of Proceeding and Investigation and Assessment of Costs and Prehearing Conference, *Investigation into the Wholesale Billing Practices of Wisconsin Bell, Inc., d/b/a SBC Wisconsin*, Docket No. 6720 TI-183, mailed July 10, 2003.

[221] Application at 29.

[222] *Id.* at 30-31.

occasions, taken an extraordinarily long time to process AT&T's requests for raw data.[223] Additionally, AT&T has also found that the raw data that SBC has provided is incomplete or inaccurate.[224] Furthermore, although SBC touts the fact that the raw data for 87 measures are available on its website, SBC's affiliates provide a web-based application that gives CLECs access to the raw data underlying *all* of the performance measures. Against this backdrop, SBC's arguments heralding the access that CLECs have to its raw data ring hollow.[225]

VI. THE PERFORMANCE REMEDY PLANS WILL NOT DETER ANTI-COMPETITIVE CONDUCT

193. Contrary to SBC's claims, the performance remedy plans on which it relies contain inherent defects that would preclude them from serving as an effective deterrent to anti-competitive conduct in the wake of 271 relief. In this regard, when this Commission approved Bell Atlantic's 271 application for authority to provide in-region, interLATA service in New York, the Commission recognized that "[t]he section 271 process in New York exemplifies the way in which rigorous state proceedings can contribute to the success of a section 271

[223] *See* Moore/Connolly/DeYoung Reply Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I*) ¶¶ 130-131; Moore/Connolly Supplemental Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I*) ¶¶ 142-148; Moore/Connolly Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) ¶¶ 118, 123, 126.

[224] *See* Moore/Connolly Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I*) ¶¶ 148-149; Moore/Connolly Reply Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I*) ¶¶ 130-132; Moore/Connolly/DeYoung Supplemental Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding I*) ¶ 149; Moore/Connolly Decl. (*Michigan 271 Proceeding II*) ¶¶ 118-122.

[225] SBC's own inadequate performance results show that it has not performed at parity. For example, SBC's reported Illinois statewide results show that SBC's retail lines generate lower trouble report rates than those for AT&T's UNE-P business lines. Indeed, in Illinois in March 2003 and May 2003, SBC failed the parity standard under Performance Measurement 37 (Trouble Report Rate) for AT&T's UNE-P business lines. Similarly, SBC's Ohio statewide results reveal that SBC has failed the parity standard for Performance Measurement 37. SBC's performance results show that, in March, April, and May 2003, SBC's retail lines consistently generated lower trouble report rates than those for AT&T's UNE-P business lines.

application."[226] In that connection, the Commission identified certain "elements that were particularly important to the success of this process in opening local markets to competition consistent with the terms of the 1996 Act," including "full and open participation by all interested parties" and "adoption of performance assurance measures that create a strong financial incentive for post-entry compliance with the section 271 checklist . . . ."[227]

194. In its *New York 271 Order*, the Commission also explained that, when an applicant relies on a performance remedy plan, the Commission, as part of its "independent determination" will review the details of that plan to assess whether it provides sufficient incentives for future compliance with Section 271.[228] Thus, the Commission has rejected the notion that it should merely defer to a State Commission's finding that a performance remedy plan is sufficient.

195. Moreover, although the Commission has not identified all of the criteria that a given performance remedy plan should satisfy in order to assure future checklist compliance, it has identified certain "important characteristics" that increase the likelihood that the enforcement mechanisms "will be effective in practice."[229] In its *New York 271 Order*, the Commission found that the New York performance assurance plan would serve as an effective deterrent to anti-competitive conduct because it contained the following characteristics:

---

[226] *New York 271 Order* ¶ 8.

[227] *Id.*

[228] *New York 271 Order* ¶ 433. *See also Texas 271 Order* ¶ 423; *Kansas/Oklahoma 271 Order* ¶ 273.

[229] *New York 271 Order* ¶ 433.

- potential liability that provided a "meaningful and significant incentive to comply with the designated performance standards";
- "clearly-articulated, pre-determined measures and standards," which encompass a "comprehensible range of carrier-to-carrier performance";
- "a reasonable structure designed to detect and sanction poor performance";
- a self-executing mechanism "that does not leave the door open unreasonably to litigation and appeal"; and
- "reasonable assurances that the reported data is accurate."[230]

196. In its decisions reviewing subsequent Section 271 applications, the Commission has similarly reviewed the performance remedy plan in the State at issue for these characteristics.[231]

A. SBC's Voluntary Remedy Plans Will Not Deter Anticompetitive Conduct.

197. Contrary to SBC's claims, the Illinois, Ohio and Wisconsin[232] remedy plans on which it relies are not self-executing mechanisms that will assure future statutory

[230] *Id.* ¶ 433.

[231] *See, e.g., Texas 271 Order* ¶¶ 424-429; *Kansas/Oklahoma 271 Order* ¶¶ 273-278; *Massachusetts 271 Order* ¶¶ 240-247.

[232] The Wisconsin performance remedy plan upon which SBC relies for 271 approval is Wisconsin Bell's Compromise Remedy Plan which is incorporated into two interconnection agreements that Wisconsin Bell has entered into with TDS and Time Warner. Critically, as SBC concedes, the PSCW has "declined to make a determination as to the sufficiency of Wisconsin Bell's Compromise Remedy Plan for § 271 purposes." Vandersanden Aff. ¶ 39. In approving the interconnection agreement, the PSCW stressed that "nothing herein should be construed to mean that the Commission finds the Agreement sufficient for 47 U.S.C. § 271 purposes," and that "approval of the Agreement does not in any way waive the Commission's right to pursue appeals of court decisions on the remedy plan ordered in docket 6720-TI-160, or to order a different statewide remedy plan." Order Approving Interconnection Agreement, PSCW Docket 05-TI-712, dated January 6, 2003 at 2. Indeed, in PSCW Docket No. 6720-TI-160, the PSCW ordered a performance remedy plan that SBC rejected. Wisconsin Bell sought judicial review of the PSCW's Order, and the Circuit Court of Milwaukee County vacated the PSCW's Final Decision (Phase

(footnote continued on next page)

compliance. Indeed, if anything, SBC's performance remedy plans in these states "leave the door open unreasonably to litigation and appeal."

198. In this regard, Section 6.4 of the performance remedy plans in Illinois, Ohio and Wisconsin provides, in pertinent part, that any modifications to the performance remedy plan can only be effected with the mutual consent of the parties.[233] Based upon this provision, SBC has taken the position that it can veto any proposed changes to the performance remedy plans that are not to its liking. Indeed, it is also possible that SBC could withdraw from the remedy plans at any time. Because SBC can essentially block any changes to the remedy plan with which it disagrees, the voluntary remedy plans in Illinois, Ohio and Wisconsin can become static plans that will never reflect the dynamism in the telecommunications market or changes that are necessary to assure the efficacy of the remedial provisions therein. SWBT's conduct in Texas after Section 271 approval highlights the dangers of such voluntary plans.

199. In its Texas Section 271 application, SWBT assured the Commission that its Texas remedy plan satisfied all of the key elements of an effective performance enforcement plan identified by the Commission in its *New York 271 Order*. In this regard, SWBT represented to the Commission that it had "agreed to make self-executing performance payments in the event

---

(footnote continued from previous page)
One) relating to the PSCW's adoption of the performance remedy plan. The PSCW continues to support the remedy plan that it ordered and has appealed the Circuit Court's order. The PSCW's appeal is currently pending.

[233] *See* Ehr (Illinois) Aff., Attach. A, § 6.4 at 6; Ehr (Ohio) Aff., Attach. A., § 6.4 at 6; Ehr (Wisconsin) Aff., Attach. A., § 6.4 at 6.

its performance does not meet the Texas PUC's standards."[234] In fact, SWBT asserted that the payment provisions under the Texas plan were "self-executing without *any opportunities for appeal* that would conceivably affect SWBT's incentives to comply."[235] Moreover, SWBT assured the Commission that the Texas remedy plan was so carefully structured that SWBT's ability to challenge any remedy payment was confined to an extremely narrow and discrete set of circumstances:

> SWBT's performance remedy plan is self-executing. It is only in cases where SWBT payments exceed a specified procedural threshold -- $3 million to an individual CLEC or the Tier I payments in a single month for CLECs as a whole exceed the cap -- that SWBT even has the right to commence a 'show cause' proceeding regarding the payments. In such a show cause proceeding, SWBT would have the burden of proof to demonstrate why, under all the circumstances, it would be unjust to require SWBT to pay liquidated damages in excess of the applicable $3 million on the monthly cap threshold amount. Even under this scenario, moreover, SWBT must pay the damage payment into an escrow fund until a determination can be made as to whether or not the performance disparity that triggered the payments reflects a SWBT-caused problem.[236]

200. Additionally, in its Texas 271 application, SWBT touted the fact that the Texas remedy plan included provisions that would spawn ongoing revisions and improvements to performance measures that would reflect the dynamism of the telecommunications market. Thus, SWBT heralded the fact that the six-month review procedure in the Texas remedy plan required that "SWBT, the TPUC, and CLECs … re-evaluate performance measurements and

[234] SWBT Brief in Support of Application by Southwestern Bell for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Texas ("SWBT Tex. Application") at 20.

[235] *Id.* at 22 (emphasis added).

[236] Affidavit of William R. Dysart, *Application by Southwestern Bell for Provision of In-Region InterLATA Services in Texas* at 21.

parity or benchmark levels to determine if adjustments should be made.[237] Relatedly, in obtaining the support of the Texas PUC for its Section 271 application, SWBT indicated that it planned to comply with future directives issued by the Texas PUC, and that it would willingly participate in the six-month review process.[238]

201. In its *Texas 271 Order*, relying upon, *inter alia,* SWBT's representations regarding the effectiveness of the Texas remedy plan, the Commission found that SWBT's Texas remedy plan was "reasonably self-executing."[239] However, SWBT's conduct after Section 271 approval confirms that the Texas remedy plan has not lived up to the high expectations of this Commission.

202. After SWBT obtained Texas 271 approval, the second six month review proceeding culminated in an order from the Texas PUC directing SWBT to implement certain revisions to performance measures and to pay penalties "based on the discrepancy of corrected data that overstated its performance delivered to CLEC."[240] The second six-month review proceeding that preceded the Texas PUC's issuance of this order included two full days of hearing during which eleven witnesses presented testimony on behalf of SWBT. After the six

[237] *Id.* at 17.

[238] *See* AT&T Communications of Texas, L.P.'s Surreply to SWBT's Motion for Rehearing and Clarification, Project 20400, *Section 271 Compliance Monitoring of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company of Texas* (Tex. PUC) (Aug. 31, 2001) at 9 n. 4.

[239] *Texas 271 Order* § 427 (footnote omitted).

[240] Order No. 33 Approving Modifications to Performance Remedy Plan and Performance Measurements, Project No. 20400, *Section 271 Compliance Monitoring of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company of Texas*.

month review process, two full days of hearings, extensive off-the-record informal conferences, and the issuance of an order by the Texas PUC, SWBT filed a petition for reconsideration challenging the very authority of the Texas PUC to compel it to comply with any order arising out of the six-month review process.[241]

203. Notably, SWBT informed the Texas PUC that it could *not* compel it to make performance remedy payments:

> The Performance Remedy Plan is a form of liquidated damages to which both parties must voluntarily agree in order for the penalty to be lawful and binding. SWBT does not agree to liquidated damages for those identified PMs and any attempt to compel a negotiated agreement would constitute a violation of SWBT's constitutional rights to due process.[242]

204. Further, during its review of DSL performance measures, the Texas PUC Staff requested that the parties submit any proposed revisions to the Texas performance remedy plan that would provide incentives for SWBT to improve its performance with respect to DSL performance measurements. In response to that request, SWBT stated that "the Performance Remedy Plan cannot be changed without the mutual consent of the parties . . . [and that it] is *not amenable to changes* in the plan based on its current high level of performance."[243]

---

[241] Southwestern Bell Telephone Company's Motion for Rehearing and Clarification, Project 20400 (Tex. PUC) (July 2, 2001) at 3.

[242] Southwestern Bell Telephone Company's Motion for Rehearing and Clarification, Project No. 20400 (Tex. PUC) (July 2, 2001) at 4 n. 3.

[243] Southwestern Bell Telephone Company's Proposal with Regard to the Performance Remedy Plan, Project No. 20400 (Tex. PUC) (Aug. 15, 2001) at 1 (Ex. 12) (emphasis added). *See also* Southwestern Bell Telephone Company's Response to the Recommendations of AT&T Communications of Texas, L.P. Regarding Remedies for SWBT Performance on DSL-Related Measures Reviewed at the June 29, 2001 Workshop Motion to Include Line-Sharing Performance Measures Within LMOS Audit, and

(footnote continued on next page)

205. Additionally, in an order issued on October 17, 2002, the Texas PUC approved certain revisions to the performance remedy plan and performance metrics contained in Attachment 17 to the Texas 271 interconnection agreement, including modifications to the K Table in the performance remedy plan.[244] Noting that the modifications proposed by the Texas PUC were "unwarranted," "unfair," and "egregious," SWBT asserted that the original provisions in the performance remedy plan must remain "intact" because it rejected the modifications ordered by the Texas PUC:

> [A]ccording to the clear terms of § 6.4 of Attachment 17 of the T2A, any change or modification to the performance remedy plans requires the mutual agreement of the parties. This motion for reconsideration sets forth SWBT's rationale as to why it cannot agree to the modifications to the performance remedy plan in Order No. 45 addressed here. Accordingly, as SWBT has stated previously in this sixth-month review, § 6.4 requires that the performance remedy plan remain intact, as originally intended, if the parties cannot mutually agree to the modification to the plan, despite their best efforts to come to closure.[245]

206. Critically, SWBT's basic stance that any changes to the performance remedy plan require its consent has carried over into its negotiations regarding a new interconnection agreement. To put SBC's current position in perspective, it is important to

---

(footnote continued from previous page)
Recommendations of XO Texas, Inc. Regarding Remedies for SWBT Performance and Key Measures Affecting Facilities-Based Providers, Project No. 20400 (Tex. PUC) (Aug. 31, 2001) at 29 (Ex. 13) (stating that the "remedy plan under the express terms of the T2A, can only be changed by mutual agreement of the parties . . . [and] *SWBT is not agreeable to any changes in the performance remedy plan at this time*") (emphasis added).

[244] Order No. 45 Approving Modifications to Performance Remedy Plan and Performance Measurements, Section 271 Compliance Monitoring of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company of Texas, Project No. 20400 (Public Utility Commission of Texas, dated October 17, 2002).

[245] Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. D/B/A Southwestern Bell Telephone Company Motion for Reconsideration and Clarification of Order No. 45, Project No. 20400, dated November 1, 2002.

emphasize the circumstances under which this Commission granted SWBT Section 271 approval in Texas. In this regard, in its *Texas 271 Order*, this Commission noted that "one factor it may consider as part of its public interest analysis is whether a BOC would continue to satisfy the requirements of section 271 after entering the long distance market."[246] This Commission also found "that SWBT's performance remedy plan provides additional assurance that the local market will remain open after SWBT receives section 271 authorization."[247]

207. Because the interconnection agreement with SWBT expires in October 2003, the parties are currently in the process of negotiating a new agreement. Significantly, although this Commission firmly believed that SWBT would continue to satisfy its Section 271 obligations after Section 271 approval, SBC recently informed AT&T that "*SBC's 271 obligations, including the obligation to provide performance measurements, will cease with the expiration of the T2A*."[248] Thus, SBC has taken the misguided and shocking position that it has no Section 271 obligations once its interconnection agreement with AT&T expires.

208. Worse yet, the proposed interconnection agreement that SBC has offered as a replacement for the current T2A limits SBC's performance reporting obligations to only eight measures: (1) OSS Interface Availability; (2) Order Confirmation Timeliness; (3) Order Completion Notifier Timeliness; (4) Percent Missed Due Dates; (5) Installation Quality; (6)

[246] *Texas 217 Order* ¶ 420.

[247] *Id.*

[248] Electronic message from Stacey Maris (SBC) to Kathleen Whiteaker (AT&T), dated July 11, 2003 (emphasis added), attached as Attach. 9.

Trouble Report Rate; (7) Repeat Trouble Report Rate; and (8) Mean Time to Restore. SBC's proposed T2A, which limits its reporting obligations to eight paltry measures, glaringly omits measures that are important to competitive entry, including metrics which SBC has conceded are key measures. Thus, for example, SWBT's proposal includes none of the "key" measures on Coordinated Conversions that SBC touts in its application.[249]

209. Similarly, this Commission has recognized that the degree to which orders flow through a BOC's systems without manual intervention is "a potential indicator of a wide range of problems that underlie a determination of whether a BOC provided nondiscriminatory access to its OSS."[250] However, SWBT's proposal includes no metric on flow through.

210. As part of its OSS obligations under the Act and the competitive checklist, SBC is required to "provide nondiscriminatory access to its billing functions, which is necessary to enable competing carriers to provide accurate and timely bills to their customers."[251] And, as AT&T has pointed out, SBC's billing performance has been subpar. Importantly, SWBT's proposal is bereft of any of the "key" billing measures on which SBC relies in this application.[252]

---

[249] *See* Attachment 10, which is SWBT's Appendix 1 – Performance Measurements Business Rules to the proposed new interconnection agreement. SWBT's proposal does not include the following metrics which SBC has conceded are key measures: Performance Measurements 114 (Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)); 114.1 (CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval); 115 (Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers); 115.1 (Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports); and MI 3 (Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval).

[250] *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Order* ¶ 143; *Texas 271 Order* ¶ 179.

[251] *Qwest Minnesota 271 Order*, Appendix K, ¶ 49.

[252] SWBT's proposal excludes the following billing measures that SBC has conceded are key metrics: Performance Measurements 14 (Billing Accuracy); 17 (Billing Completeness); 18 (Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)); and 19 (Daily Usage Feed Timeliness).

211. In addition, this Commission has repeatedly stressed the "critical" importance of timely jeopardy notices to CLECs so that they can inform their customers when service will not be installed on the scheduled due date and promptly reschedule the time for service installation.[253] Similarly, SBC has conceded that PM 10.4 (Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices) is a key measure. However, SWBT's proposed T2A includes no metrics on jeopardy notices.

212. Moreover, SWBT's proposal glaringly omits other measures that are important to competitive entry, such as: Performance Measurements 17.1 (Service Order Posting); 70 (Percentage Trunk Blockage); and 107 (Percentage Missed Collocation Due Dates). Additionally, SWBT's proposal excludes the following metrics that SBC has conceded are key measures.

- 1.2 – Average Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders
- 9 – Percent Rejects
- 10 – Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR
- 10.1 – Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order
- 10.2 – Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours
- 10.3 – Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours
- 11 – Mean Time to Return Rejects
- 11.1 – Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface
- 11.2 – Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received through the Manual Process
- 38 – Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS)

[253] *First Louisiana 271 Order* ¶ 39; *Second Louisiana 271 Order* ¶¶ 13, 133.

- 40 – Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours (Resale POTS)
- 96 – Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders
- 110 – Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs
- MI 13 – Percent Loss Notification Within One Hour of Service Order Completion[254]

213. SWBT's efforts in Texas to thwart changes to the remedy plan that are not to its liking, its stated position in Texas that its Section 271 obligations cease with the expiration of the T2A, and the proposed interconnection agreement it has offered AT&T which limits SWBT's reporting obligations to eight measures demonstrate the inherent dangers of the voluntary plans in Illinois, Wisconsin and Ohio where SBC has taken the position that its consent is necessary to change its remedy plans. Against this backdrop, SBC cannot legitimately contend that its Illinois, Indiana and Wisconsin performance remedy plans contain self-executing remedies that will assure future checklist compliance.

B. SBC's Ohio Performance Plan Was Not Developed With The Participation And Input Of The CLECs.

214. As noted above, in approving Bell Atlantic's New York 271 application, the Commission has recognized that, among the "elements that were particularly important to the success of this process in opening local markets to competition" were the "full and open participation by all interested parties and the "adoption of performance assurance measures that create a strong financial incentive for post-entry compliance with the section 271

[254] Performance Measurement MI 13 in the Ameritech region is equivalent to Performance Measurement 12.2 in Texas.

checklist . . ."[255] In its application, SBC contends that each of the four state Commissions, including the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, instituted proceedings in which "all interested parties could participate" and implemented "comprehensive performance monitoring mechanisms."[256]

215. However, unlike New York, where the CLECs participated in proceedings and were permitted to provide input regarding the appropriate contours of a performance remedy plan, the Public Utilities Commission of Ohio, without conducting any hearings or permitting any input from the CLECs, simply adopted the Texas remedy plan as the performance plan for Ohio. In doing so, the PUCO not only disregarded Commission precedent which has emphasized the importance of "full and open participation of all interested parties," but it also failed to comply with its own procedures that it had established.

216. In this regard, the SBC/Ameritech Merger Stipulation approved by the PUCO on February 23, 1999, established the "Collaborative Process for Implementing OSS and Facilities Performance Measurements, Standards/Benchmarks, and Remedies" which provided for the establishment of a task force that would evaluate, *inter alia*, the performance enforcement mechanisms that should apply for SBC's failure to satisfy parity and benchmark standards. The Merger Stipulation also provided, in pertinent part, that "[f]or each Agreed to Standard/Benchmark to be implemented in Ohio that was an SBC agreed-upon remedy in Texas,

[255] *New York 271 Order* ¶ 8.

[256] Application at 23.

SBC/Ameritech will discuss with the collaborative participants the proposed remedy to be attached to such Agreed to Standard/Benchmark in Ohio."[257] Furthermore, the Merger Stipulation provided that "[f]or a minimum of one year following the Merger Closing Date, and thereafter on an as-needed basis as determined by the Staff, participants in the collaborative process will collaborate to implement any additions, deletions, or changes to the performance measurements, standards/benchmarks, and remedies that are implemented by SBC/Ameritech in Ohio."[258] Importantly, the Merger Stipulation also stated, "[i]f a dispute over any such addition, deletion, or change cannot be resolved through the collaborative process, any participant may ask the Commission to resolve such dispute."[259]

217. Subsequently, the PUCO adopted a Stipulation and Recommendation in Case No. 93-487-TP-ALT ("Altreg Stipulation"), which referenced the provisions of the Merger Stipulation cited above which made clear that participants in the collaborative process were entitled to bring any disputes regarding any "additions, deletions or changes" to the remedy plan to the PUCO for expedited resolution.

218. By Entry Order dated June 1, 2000, the PUCO adopted a two-phased approach to its examination of SBC's expected Section 271 application, Phase II of which was to "include the review of a generic Section 271 agreement and performance assurance plan."[260]

[257] Merger Stipulation, IV.D.8 at 13-14.

[258] *Id.*, IV.D.11.

[259] *Id.*

[260] June 1, 2000 Entry at 7.

219. In compliance with the Commission's decisions, on October 10, 2000, a CLEC coalition filed a petition seeking resolution of unresolved issues, which included a request for the establishment of an Ohio-specific performance assurance plan. On June 25, 2001, the PUCO deferred setting a schedule for the resolution of issues associated with a performance remedy plan.

220. On July 19, 2001, the CLECs renewed their request for a permanent Ohio-specific performance remedy plan.[261] On August 29, 2002, for the third time, the CLECs requested an expedited proceeding to address the adoption of an Ohio-specific permanent remedy plan.[262]

221. Remarkably, without conducting any hearings or permitting input from the CLECs via filings or workshops, the PUCO, in a January 30, 2003 decision, denied the CLECs' requests for dispute resolution relating to the establishment of an Ohio-specific remedy plan.[263] The PUCO stated that it would not consider whether the existing remedy plan – the Texas-based remedy plan arising out of the SBC-Ameritech merger – should be replaced. The PUCO further

[261] CLEC Brief Requesting Resolution of Disputed Issues, Case No. 00-942-TP-COI (PUCO, July 19, 2001).

[262] Motion of WorldCom Inc., AT&T Communications of Ohio/TCG Ohio, Time Warner Telecom, TCG Telecom Group, KMC Telecom III, Inc., XO Ohio, Inc., Allegiance Telecom of Ohio, Inc., and LDMI Telecommunications, Inc. for Leave to File Supplemental Information Instanter Regarding the Remedy Plan and Briefing Schedule.

[263] Entry, Case No. 00-924-TP-COI (PUCO, January 30, 2003).

stated that its "charge relative to the remedy plan is limited to opining on the reasonableness of the remedy plan that had been in effect."[264]

222. The PUCO's analysis in its January 30, 2003 decision is fundamentally infirm for several reasons. First, the Ohio remedy plan is based on the antiquated Texas remedy plan that is not tailored to Ohio. Indeed, the Ohio remedy plan is based upon the *initial* Texas remedy plan arising out of the SBC Ameritech merger. Four years have passed since the plan went into effect. As this Commission has recognized, "the development of performance measures and appropriate remedies is an evolutionary process that requires changes to both measures and remedies over time."[265] Importantly, the initial Texas remedy plan has been modified substantially by the Texas PUC because of the inherent defects in that plan which became apparent over time. As noted above, SBC has refused to "consent" to these modifications ordered by the Texas PUC. Moreover, the remedy plan approved by the PUCO – the dated initial Texas remedy plan – is a plan which even the Texas PUC has found to be defective.

223. Second, the PUCO's Order of January 30, 2003 is demonstrably unsound because it runs counter to this Commission's 271 orders which have touted the importance of the collaborative process in developing performance remedy plans.[266] As noted above, in approving

[264] *Id.* at ¶ 10.

[265] *Georgia/Louisiana 271 Order* ¶ 294.

[266] In addition, the PUCO's decision is procedurally defective because it ignored its own rules requiring adjudication of this issue.

prior 271 applications this Commission has emphasized the critical importance of an open process where parties can provide input regarding the appropriate contours of a remedy plan.

224. Thus, for example, in finding that the enforcement plans in Georgia and Louisiana "provide sufficient incentives to foster post-entry checklist compliance," this Commission noted that "the Georgia plan was developed in an open proceeding with participation by all sectors of the industry and that concerns raised by commenters in the state proceeding were considered by the Georgia Commission."[267] The Commission also heralded the fact that "[t]he Louisiana plan was similarly developed in workshops and an open proceeding with participation by interested parties."[268] In stark contrast, the PUCO rejected the CLECs' repeated requests for proceedings so that they could provide input regarding the inherent defects in the Texas-based remedy plan that the PUCO adopted and share their concerns regarding an appropriate remedial structure that would be tailored to the needs of Ohio. Inexplicably, however, the PUCO categorically rejected the CLECs' requests for the kinds of open proceedings that this Commission has repeatedly touted in prior 271 applications.

225. Third, although both the Merger Stipulation and the Altreg Stipulation clearly contemplated that the parties could invoke the expedited dispute resolution process to seek resolution of issues pertaining to the remedy plan, the PUCO refused to consider input from the CLECs on the critical issue of a permanent Ohio-tailored performance remedy plan.

---

[267] *Id.* ¶ 293.

[268] *Id.* (footnote omitted).

226. In a CLEC Application for Rehearing dated March 3, 2003, the CLECs requested the PUCO to grant rehearing on these issues. In an Entry on Rehearing, the PUCO granted in part and denied in part the CLECs' application.[269] In that decision, the PUCO stated that it would "open a new docket for the purpose of considering any revisions that must be implemented in order for SBC's Ohio remedy plan to continue to effectively satisfy the purpose for which it was intended, including to address backsliding concerns."[270]

227. In all events, the Ohio remedy plan that on which SBC relies in its application cannot possibly serve to deter backsliding in the wake of Section 271 relief. The Ohio remedy plan is based on the antiquated Texas remedy plan which the Texas PUC has modified because of the inherent defects in the original plan. Furthermore, the Ohio remedy plan has not been tailored to address the specific Ohio competitive landscape. Additionally, unlike other remedy plans which have been blessed by this Commission, the Ohio remedy plan on which SBC relies is not the result of a collaborative process in which the CLEC industry has participated. For all of these reasons, SBC cannot legitimately contend that the Ohio remedy plan satisfies the key criteria in remedy plans that this Commission has approved in prior Section 271 applications.

CONCLUSION

228. None of SBC's attempts to rationalize why this Commission should rely on the flawed and limited tests that SBC unilaterally obtained from E&Y – rather than the State-

[269] Entry entered March 25, 2003. Notably, almost five months later this docket has not been initiated by the PUCO.

commissioned BearingPoint tests – has merit. The pervasive and profound differences between the BearingPoint and E&Y tests show that the E&Y audits are not appropriate surrogates for the State-commissioned BearingPoint tests. Moreover, the inherent limitations and deficiencies in E&Y's testing preclude any finding that the E&Y audits can reasonably be relied upon as proof of the reliability of SBC's data.

229. The evidence of ongoing and unresolved performance monitoring and reporting problems that have been documented by BearingPoint and which remain unresolved foreclose SBC's breezy assertions that its performance data are reliable, accurate and complete.[271] To date, SBC has passed only 48 to 57% of the BearingPoint test criteria. This Commission has never approved a Section 271 application with such a poor showing by a BOC in a performance metrics test. The Commission should not break with that precedent now.

230. Furthermore, the remedy plans on which SBC relies cannot and will not assure SBC's future statutory compliance. SBC's conduct in Texas where it has flouted orders and refused to implement changes to the remedy plan ordered by the Texas PUC, its stated position that its Section 271 obligations terminate with the expiration of its interconnection agreement, and its proposed new interconnection agreement which excludes scores of performance measures which are critical to competitive entry, demonstrate that the voluntary

---

(footnote continued from previous page)
[270] *Id.* at 2.

[271] Furthermore, SBC cannot seriously contend that its provisioning of raw data to CLECs constitutes additional indicia of the reliability of its data. Indeed, unlike SBC's affiliates which provide a web-based application that CLECs can access to obtain the raw data for all performance measurements, SBC
(footnote continued on next page)

plans in Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin on which SBC so heavily relies cannot and will not assure that SBC will comply with its Section 271 obligations in the future.

231. The Ohio plan on which SBC relies is fundamentally flawed in other important respects. The Ohio plan is based upon the initial Texas plan – a plan that even the Texas PUC recognized must be modified to correct the fundamental infirmities in the original remedial structure. Furthermore, breaking with this Commission's precedent, the PUCO repeatedly refused the CLECs' request for open proceedings so that they could provide input regarding the appropriate contours of a permanent, Ohio-specific remedy plan. The PUCO's refusal to permit such input not only runs counter to this Commission's precedent, but it also runs counter to the PUCO's own orders which clearly contemplated that the parties would participate in a collaborative process.

232. For all of these reasons, the pool of evidence shows that SBC has not met its burden of demonstrating that its performance data are accurate and reliable or that it will comply with its section 271 obligations in the wake of Section 271 relief.

(footnote continued from previous page)
provides raw data access for less than a third of the measures. Thus, CLECs are hampered in their ability to use SBC's raw data as another point of reference in determining the accuracy of SBC's data.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

/s/ Karen W. Moore

Karen W. Moore

Executed on August 6, 2003

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

_____/s/ Timothy M. Connolly_____
Timothy M. Connolly

Executed on August 6, 2003

Attachment 7

Attachment D-WI

Legend for the Wisconsin Blind Replication* Status Summary as of June 4, 2003**

Column Heading	Definition	Possible Entries	Entry Descriptions
Performance Measurement	The performance measurement number and name as assigned in the published metrics business rules v1.8.		
Product Disaggregation	The associated sub-metrics as defined in the published metrics business rules v1.8. This status summary presents blind replication progress (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for the product-level disaggregations reported by SBC Midwest. SBC Midwest is required to report geographic disaggregations for some of these performance measures, as defined in the published metrics business rules. BearingPoint evaluates each of the disaggregations that SBC Midwest is required to report.		Example: % Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – Field Work
July 2002, August 2002, September 2002 *The test is being conducted using the February 5, 2003 posted results for the July 2002, August 2002 and September 2002 data months.*	CLEC Value - indicates whether BearingPoint-calculated values match SBC Midwest-reported aggregate CLEC values within +/- one percent (inclusive). SBC Midwest Value - indicates whether BearingPoint-calculated values match SBC Midwest-reported retail values within +/- one percent (inclusive). This status summary presents blind replication progress (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for CLEC values and retail values (or retail affiliate values, where noted) reported by SBC Midwest for the state of Wisconsin. (The reported values for a performance measure may include a CLEC numerator, a CLEC denominator, a CLEC value, a retail value, a retail affiliate value, a benchmark and a z-value for each disaggregation, as defined in the published metrics business rules.)	M (Match)	Reported values and independently-calculated values agree within +/- one percent (inclusive).
		NM (Non Match)	A discrepancy of +/- five percent or more; or a discrepancy of between +/- one and five percent that would, if corrected, cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse.
		NMM (Non Material Match)	A discrepancy that would, if corrected, change the original reported performance measurement result by between +/- one and five percent; and would not, if corrected, cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse.
		Blank	The evaluation of the reported value is not complete.
Status	The status of blind replication (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for this disaggregation.	Not Started	The evaluation of the reported value has not begun.
		In Progress	The evaluation of the reported value is in progress.
		Completed	The evaluation of the reported value is complete.
Complete Date	The date on which blind replication (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") was completed.	Date	The evaluation for the reported value was completed on the date provided.
		Blank	The evaluation of the reported value is not complete.
Comments	Published Observations and Exceptions numbers (see www.osstesting.com) pertinent to the corresponding disaggregation, along with the type of discrepancy (i.e., calculation (PMR5-2), business rule (PMR5-3), or exclusion (PMR5-4)) are noted.		
Footnotes	Notes to assist with interpretation of this status summary.		

** "Blind Replication" refers to evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree."*
*** Blind replication status is reported as of June 4, 2003, unless otherwise noted.*

SELECTED SBC MIDWEST PERFORMANCE MEASURES

PRE-ORDERING
1.2 - Average Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders

ORDERING
5 - Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) Returned within "X" Hours
7 - Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System
9 - Percent Rejects
10 - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR
10.1 - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order
10.2 - Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours
10.3 - Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours
10.4 - Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices
11 - Mean Time to Return Rejects
11.1 - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface
11.2 - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received through the Manual Process
13 - Order Process Percent Flow-Through

PROVISIONING
12 - Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy
27 - Mean Installation Interval
28 - Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date
29 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale POTS)
35 - Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation
45 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations)
56 - Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date
56.1 - Percent Installations Completed With the Customer Requested Due Date for Loop With LNP
58 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Unbundled Network Elements)

MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR
37 - Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS)
37.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
38 - Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS)
39 - Receipt to Clear Duration
40 - Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours (Resale POTS)
41 - Percent Repeat Reports (Resale POTS)
54.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
67 - Mean Time to Restore (Unbundled Network Elements)

BILLING
14 - Billing Accuracy
17 - Billing Completeness
18 - Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)
19 - Daily Usage Feed Timeliness

INTERCONNECTION TRUNKS
73 - Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks
78 - Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval

LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY
91 - Percent of LNP Due Dates with Industry Guidelines
96 - Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders

DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE DATABASE
110 - Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs

COORDINATED CONVERSION
114 - Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)
114.1 - CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval
115 - Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers
115.1 - Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports
MI 3 - Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval

OTHER
MI 9 - Percentage Missing FOCs
MI 11 - Average Interface Outage Notification
MI 13 - Percent Loss Notification within One Hour of Service Order Completion
MI 14 - Percent Completion Notifications Returned within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
Pre-Ordering Metrics												
1.2[6] - Average Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders	1	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Manually	NM						In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR119 **Business Rule Discrepancies:** O697 (closed unresolved)	
	2	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Electronically	M						In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O697 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Pre-Ordering Metrics - Total Non Matches			1	0	0	0	0	0				
Ordering Metrics												
5[4] - Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOC) Returned Within "X" Hours (Evaluated as of 6/16/03)	3	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	4	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines) -MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	5	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	6	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	7	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	8	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	9	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	10	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	11	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	12	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	13	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	14	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	15	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	16	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	17	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	18	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	19	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	20	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	21	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	22	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	23	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	24	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	25	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	26	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	27	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	28	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	29	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (>= 5 DS1) -	M		M				In Progress			
	30	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1 - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	31	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3 - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	32	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	33	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	34	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	35	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	36	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 hrs - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	37	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	38	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	39	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	40	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	41	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	42	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	43	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	44	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	45	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	46	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	47	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	48	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	49	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	50	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	51	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	52	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	53	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	54	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	55	% FOCs Returned within 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	56	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	57	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	58	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines) -ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	59	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	60	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	61	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	62	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	63	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
	64	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	65	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	66	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	67	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	68	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	69	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	70	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	71	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	72	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	73	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	74	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	75	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	76	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	77	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	78	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	79	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	80	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	81	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	82	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	83	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (>= 5 DS1) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	84	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1 - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	85	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3 - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	86	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	87	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	88	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	89	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	90	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 hrs - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	91	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	92	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	93	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	94	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	95	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	96	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	97	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	98	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	99	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	100	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	101	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	102	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	103	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	104	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	105	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	106	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	107	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	108	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	109	% FOCs Returned within 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	110	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
7[5] - Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System	111	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - Combinations							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O659v2 (closed unresolved), O429v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O854	
	112	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - Resale							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O659v2 (closed unresolved), O429v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787, O854	
	113	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - UNE							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O659v2 (closed unresolved), O429v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O854	
9[4] - Percent Rejects	114	% CLEC Caused Rejects - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O688v2 (closed unresolved)	
	115	% Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O688v2 (closed unresolved)	
	116	% CLEC Caused Rejects - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O688v2 (closed unresolved)	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
	117	% Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O688v2 (closed unresolved)	
10[4] - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR	118	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR - MOR/Tel							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O823 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O803 (closed	
	119	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O823 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O803 (closed	
10.1[4] - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order	120	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
	121	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
10.2[4] - Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours	122	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned within 5 Hours - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
	123	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned within 5 Hours - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
10.3[4] - Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours	124	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned within 5 Hours - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
	125	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned within 5 Hours - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
10.4[5] - Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices	126	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – Field Work							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	127	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – No Field Work							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	128	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Business – Field Work							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	129	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Business – No Field Work							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	130	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Special – Field Work							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	131	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Special – No Field Work							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	132	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loop with LNP							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	133	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loop without LNP							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	134	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Local Switching							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	135	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - UNE-P							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
		% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices -- Resale POTS -- FW							In Progress			
		% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices -- Resale POTS -- NFW							In Progress			
11[4] - Mean Time to Return Rejects	136	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (hours) - MOR/Tel							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O643v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O756v2 (closed unresolved), O823 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O584v2 (closed unresolved), O803 (closed unresolved)	
	137	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (hours) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O809 (closed unresolved), O756v2 (closed unresolved), O823 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O584v2 (closed unresolved), O803 (closed unresolved)	
11.1[4] - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface	138	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (hours) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O643v2 (closed unresolved), O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
	139	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (hours) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
11.2[4] - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received through the Manual Process	140	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (hours) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O643v2 (closed unresolved), O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
	141	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (hours) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
13[4] - Order Process Percent Flow-Through	142	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LNP - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	143	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LSNP - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	144	Order Process Percent Flow Through - Resale - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	145	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops - MOR/Tel	M		M						**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	146	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE-P - MOR/Tel	M		M						**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O488v3 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	147	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LNP - ICS/DSS							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	148	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LSNP - ICS/DSS							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	149	Order Process Percent Flow Through - Resale - ICS/DSS							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	150	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops - ICS/DSS							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	151	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE-P - ICS/DSS							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O488v3 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Ordering Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0	0	0				
Provisioning Metrics												
12 - Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	152	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/16/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O794 (closed unresolved)	
27 - Mean Installation Interval (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	153	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	154	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	155	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	156	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex No FW	M		M		M		Completed	4/24/2003		
	157	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
	158	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	159	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	160	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	161	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	162	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
28 - Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	163	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	164	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	165	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	166	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex No FW	M	[redacted]	M	[redacted]	M	[redacted]	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	167	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	168	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	169	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	170	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	171	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Projects	M	[redacted]	M	[redacted]	M	[redacted]	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	172	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	173	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
29 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale POTS) (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	174	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	175	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	176	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	177	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res No FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	178	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	179	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	180	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Res FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	181	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
35 - Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	182	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - FW	M	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	183	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - No FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	184	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	185	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - No FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	186	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	187	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - No FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	188	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	189	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - No FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
45 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations)	190	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DDS	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	191	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DS1	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	192	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DS3	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	193	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	194	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - ISDN PRI	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	195	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Other	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	196	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - VGPL	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	197	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	198	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - ISDN PRI	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	199	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - Other	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
56 - Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date	200	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (1-10) -- 3 Days	[redacted]				M	[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	201	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (11-20) -- 7 Days	[redacted]				M	[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	202	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (20+) -- 10 Days	[redacted]				M	[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	203	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (1-10) -- 3 Days	[redacted]				M	[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	204	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (11-20) -- 7 Days	[redacted]				M	[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
	205	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (20+) -- 10 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	206	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	207	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	208	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (20+) and all other types -- ICB					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	209	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	210	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	211	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (20+) and all other types -- ICB					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	212	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	213	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	214	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (20+) and all other types -- ICB					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	215	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 loop (includes PRI) -- 3 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	216	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (1 to 10) -- 3 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	217	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (11 to 20) -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	218	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (20+) -- ICB					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	219	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with Line Sharing		M[8]		M[8]	M	M[8]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	220	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with no Line Sharing -- Conditioned -- 10 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	221	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with no Line Sharing -- Non Conditioned -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	222	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- Analog Port -- 2 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	223	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- BRI Port (1-50) -- 3 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	224	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- BRI Port (50+) -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	225	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- PRI Port (1-20) -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	226	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- PRI Port (20+) -- 10 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	227	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - UNE Loop Projects					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
56.1 - Percent Installations Completed With the Customer Requested Due Date for Loop With LNP	228	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (1-10)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	229	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (11-20)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	230	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (20+)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	231	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (1-10)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	232	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (11-20)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	233	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (20+)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	234	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (1-10)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	235	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (11-20)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	236	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (20+)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	237	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Loop w/LNP Projects					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
58 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Unbundled Network Elements)	238	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (FW)	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	239	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (FW)	NM	M					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O613v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	**BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 613v4 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
	240	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	241	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access	NM	M					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O613v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	**BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 613v4 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**
	242	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Broadband DSL w/Line Sharing	M	M[5]					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	243	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Broadband DSL w/out Line sharing	M						In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	244	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Dark Fiber	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	245	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	M	M					*In Progress*		***Exclusion Discrepancies:*** *O711 (closed unresolved)*	
	246	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access	M	M					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O613v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	**BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 613v4 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**
	247	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	248	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops w/Line Sharing	M	M[5]					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	249	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loopsw/out Line sharing	NMM						In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O613v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	**BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 613v4 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**
	250	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	251	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D)	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	252	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B)	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	253	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Provisioning Metrics - Total Non Matches			9	8	0	0	0	0				
Maintenance and Repair Metrics												
37 - Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS) (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	254	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Bus	NMM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O627v3	
	255	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Res	NMM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O627v3	
	256	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Bus	NM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O627v3	
	257	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Res	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O627v3	
37.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	258	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	M	M					In Progress			
	259	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O639v3	
	260	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - UNE-P - Bus	NM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** *O639v3*	
	261	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - UNE-P - Res	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O639v3	
38 - Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS) (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	262	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - Dispatch							In Progress			
	263	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch							In Progress			
	264	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - Dispatch		M					In Progress			
	265	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - No Dispatch	M						In Progress			
	266	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch							In Progress			
	267	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch							In Progress			
	268	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - Dispatch	M	M					In Progress			
	269	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch							In Progress			
39 - Receipt to Clear Duration (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	270	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	271	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NMM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	272	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	273	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NMM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	274	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	275	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NMM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	276	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	277	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NM	NMM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	278	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	279	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NMM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	280	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	281	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	282	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	283	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NMM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	284	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	285	*Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)*	NM	NMM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
40 - Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours	286	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - POTS - Business	NMM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR121	
	287	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - POTS - Residence	NMM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR121	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
< 24 Hours (Resale POTS)	288	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - UNE-P Bus	NMM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR121	
	289	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - UNE-P Res	NM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR121	
41 - Percent Repeat Reports (Resale POTS) (Evaluated as of 6/11/03)	290	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	NM	NM	M	M	M	M	In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O862	
	291	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	NM	NM	M	M	M	M	In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O862	
	292	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Bus	NM	NM	M	M	M	M	In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O862	
	293	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Res	NM	NM	M	M	M	M	In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O862	
54.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports	294	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DDS	M	M					In Progress			
	295	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DS1	M						In Progress			
	296	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DS3	M	M					In Progress			
	297	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress			
	298	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - ISDN PRI	M						In Progress			
	299	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - Other Services	M	M					In Progress			
	300	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - Voice Grade Private Line	M						In Progress			
	301	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress			
	302	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	M	M					In Progress			
	303	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - Other Services	M	M					In Progress			
67 - Mean Time to Restore (Unbundled Network Elements)	304	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	305	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	306	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	307	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	308	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (hours)-Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	309	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	310	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	311	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	312	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - Dispatch (hours)	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	313	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - No Dispatch (hours)	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	314	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - Dispatch (hours)	M	[redacted]		[redacted]		[redacted]	[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	315	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch (hours)	M	[redacted]		[redacted]		[redacted]	[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	316	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (hours)-Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	317	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	318	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (hours)-Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	319	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	320	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	321	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	322	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (hours)-Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	323	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	324	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - Line Sharing - Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	325	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - Line Sharing - No Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	326	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - No Line Sharing - Dispatch	M	[redacted]		[redacted]		[redacted]	[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	327	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch	M	[redacted]		[redacted]		[redacted]	[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	328	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (hours)-Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	329	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M					[redacted]		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
	330	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D) (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	331	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D) (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	332	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							***Business Rule Discrepancies:*** *E111* (closed unresolved)	
	333	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	334	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	335	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Maintenance and Repair Metrics - Total Non Matches			19	22	0	0	0	0				
Billing Metrics												
14 - Billing Accuracy (Evaluated as of 6/19/03)	336	Billing Accuracy - Resale Monthly Recurring/Non-recurring	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	337	Billing Accuracy - Resale Usage / Unbundled Local Switching	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/19/2003		
	338	Billing Accuracy - Other UNEs	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	3/21/2003		
17 - Billing Completeness	339	Billing Completeness	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/30/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O731 (closed unresolved)	
18 - Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)	340	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill) - AEBS	M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	**Exclusions Discrepancies:** O845	***O845 is closed unresolved.***
	341	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill) - CABS	M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	**Exclusions Discrepancies:** O845	**O845 is closed unresolved.**
19 - Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	342	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	M		M		M		Completed	2/12/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O694v2 (closed unresolved), O846	**Observation 846 is closed unresolved.**
Selected Billing Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0	0	0				
Interconnection Trunk Metrics												
73 - Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks	343	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - 911	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003		
	344	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - Interconnection Trunks (Non-projects)	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003		
	345	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - OS/DA	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003		
	346	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - Projects	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003		
	347	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - SS7	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003		
78 - Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval	348	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - 911 Trunks (days)	M		M		M		In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O719 (closed unresolved)	
	349	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - Interconnection Trunks (days)	M		M		NM		In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O824 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O719 (closed unresolved)	
	350	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - OS/DA (days)	M		M		M		In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O719 (closed unresolved)	
	351	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - SS7 Links (days)	M		M		M		In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O719 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Interconnection Trunk Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		1					
LNP Metrics												
91[5] - Percent of LNP Due Dates with Industry Guidelines	352	% of LNP Only Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines - Complete							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O732, O756v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O834 (closed unresolved), O835 (closed unresolved)	
	353	% of LNP Only Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines - Partials - NXX (1-100 TNs)							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O732, O756v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O834 (closed unresolved), O835 (closed unresolved)	
96 - Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders	354	% Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP only	M						In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O710	**BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 710 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**
	355	% Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP with Loop	M						In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O710	**BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 710 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**
Selected LNP Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		0					
Directory Assistance Database Metrics												
110 - Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs	356	% of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs	M		M		M		Completed	2/19/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O689 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Directory Assistance Database Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		0					
Coordinated Conversions Metrics												

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
114 - Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers) (Evaluated as of 4/28/03)	357	% Premature Disconnects - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O631v2, O815 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	**Observation 631v2 is closed unresolved.**
	358	% Premature Disconnects - FDT	NM[7]		NM[7]		NM[7]		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O570v2 (closed unresolved), O815 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
114.1 - CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval	359	Provisioning Interval - CHC-LNP with Loop <10 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002		
	360	Provisioning Interval - CHC-LNP with Loop 10-24 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002		
	361	Provisioning Interval - FDT-LNP with Loop <10 lines	M		NM[7]		M		Completed	11/20/2002		
	362	Provisioning Interval - FDT-LNP with Loop 10-24 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002		
115 - Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers	363	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>30 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O631v2, O677v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
	364	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>60 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O631v2, O677v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
	365	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>120 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O631v2, O677v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
	366	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>30 Minutes	M		NM[7]		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O570v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
	367	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>60 Minutes	M		NM[7]		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O570v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
	368	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>120 Minutes	M		NM[7]		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O570v2 (closed unresolved) ***Exclusion Discrepancies:*** *O722 (closed unresolved)*	
115.1 - Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports	369	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O738 (closed unresolved), O722 (closed unresolved)	
	370	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - FDT	M		NM[7]		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O738 (closed unresolved), O722 (closed unresolved)	
MI3 - Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval	371	Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O631v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Coordinated Conversions Metrics - Total Non Matches			1		6		1					
Other Metrics												
MI 9[5] - Percentage Missing FOCs	372	% Missing FOCs - Resale							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O792 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	
	373	% Missing FOCs - UNE (Loops, LNP, and LSNP)							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O792 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	
	374	% Missing FOCs - UNE-P							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O792 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	
MI11 - Average Interface Outage Notification	375	Average Interface Outage Notification (Minutes)	M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O624v2, O594 (closed unresolved)	**Observation 624v2 is closed unresolved for July and August.**
MI 13[5] - Percent Loss Notification within One Hour of Service Order Completion	376	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - Resale							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	
	377	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE Loops							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	
	378	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - LNP							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	
	379	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE P							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
MI14 - Percent Completion Notifications Returned within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket	380	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Manual - Next Day	M	[redacted]		[redacted]		[redacted]	*In Progress*		***Business Rule Discrepancies:*** *O642v2,* O847 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O637v2	***Observation 847 is Closed Unresolved. BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 637v2 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03 BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 642v2 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03***
	381	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Electronic < 1 hour	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O847, *O848*	***Observation 847 is Closed Unresolved. Observation 848 is Closed Unresolved*** [redacted]
	382	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Manual - Next Day	M	[redacted]	M	[redacted]	M	[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O847 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O637v2	***Observation 847 is Closed Unresolved. Observation 848 is Closed Unresolved. BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 637v2 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03*** [redacted]
	383	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Electronic < 1 hour		[redacted]		[redacted]		[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O847, O848	***Observation 847 is Closed Unresolved. Observation 848 is Closed Unresolved*** [redacted]
	384	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Manual - Next Day	M	[redacted]		[redacted]		[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O642v2, O847 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O637v2	***Observation 847 is Closed Unresolved. BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 637v2 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03*** BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 642v2 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03
	385	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Electronic < 1 hour		[redacted]		[redacted]		[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O847, O848	***Observation 847 is Closed Unresolved. Observation 848 is Closed Unresolved.***
Selected Other Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	[redacted]	0	[redacted]	0	[redacted]				
ALL Selected Metrics - Total Non Matches			30	30	6	0	2	0				

Footnotes:

1. A "Non-Material Match (NMM)" as recorded in this chart is indicated when a value did not match within +/- 1 percent (inclusive), but the difference between reported and independently-calculated values was between +/- 1 and 5 percent and did not cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse. It is noted that the materiality threshold applied in "blind replication" (i.e., the evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") in BearingPoint's OSS test is +/- 1 percent.
2. "Status" applies to the status of "blind replication" (i.e., evaluation criterion type PMR5-2) progress for the disaggregation in the OSS test.
3. Published Observations and Exceptions numbers (see www.osstesting.com) pertinent to the corresponding disaggregation, along with the type of discrepancy (i.e., calculation, business rule, or exclusion) are noted.
4. The reporting of this performance measurement was transitioned from MOR/Tel to ICS/DSS during the test. The calculation of this performance measurement is based on data from both of these systems. For this reason, a distinction has been made in this chart between the "blind replication" status of *the MOR/Tel data component and the ICS/DSS data component for this performance measure.*
5. The reporting of this performance measurement was transtioned from MOR/Tel to ICS/DSS during the test. SBC Midwest calculates this performance measure using only ICS/DSS data.
6. The "SBC Affiliate" values are used as the retail component for parity comparison in the performance measurement. As such, the "SBC Midwest" column has been populated with the "blind replication" status of the "SBC Midwest Affiliate" values.
7. SBC Midwest has restated this value for this performance measure disaggregation.
8. In this disaggregation, the "SBC Midwest Affiliate" value is used as the retail component for parity comparison in the performance measurement. As such, the "SBC Midwest" column has been populated with the "blind replication" status of the "SBCMidwest Affiliate" values.

[redacted]		The SBC Blind Replication Status Summary as of June 4, 2003 which shows a match "M" for a given measure is inconsistent with a BearingPoint observation associated with the measure which indicates that BearingPoint has not successfully replicated the results for the measure.
[redacted]		The SBC Blind Replication Status Summary shows that testing remains in progress as of June 23, 2003, however, the related BearingPoint observation indicates that BearingPoint has completed its testing.
		The SBC Blind Replication Status Summary Comment has changed according to the BearingPoint Observation Status Summary dated July 29, 2003.
[redacted]		BearingPoint has identified an exclusion or business rule discrepancy in an observation issued after June 16, 2003.
[redacted]		The SBC Blind Replication Status Summary as of June 4, 2003 does not indicate a non-match "NM" result that BearingPoint has subsequently reported in an Observation.

Attachment 8

MR. HORST: I believe that is correct, yes.

MR. GARDON: Did you look at any other performance measures concerning -- when you looked at the billing issue?

MR. HORST: We looked at all performance measurements.

MR. GARDON: Did you look at the other ones though in terms of whether they had any impact or effect on billing related issues?

MR. HORST: Can you be more specific in that question?

MR. COX: When you looked at the accuracy of a bill, what types of bills did you look at?

MR. HORST: We looked at the accuracy and completeness of the company's performance measures.

MR. COX: And that performance measurement looks at what type of bills?

MR. HORST: PM 14 for example relates to Ameritech audits that were performed on three billing systems, ACIS, RBS, and CABS.

The business rules of that particular performance measurement, the purpose of these

audits are to review and recalculate services billed in five states.

This is to ensure that monthly bills sent to the CLECs and repo customers are rated accurately according to the billing tables.

This is performed by extracting recurring, nonrecurring, and usage elements from the above listed billing systems and comparing the billed elements to expected results.

MR. COX: So you did compare the rate tables, the master rate table with what was being billed?

MR. HORST: That's correct.

MR. COX: And you compared it to what data, CLEC, aggregate data, a specific CLEC? What data did you compare it to?

MR. GRAY: For PM 14, is we observed them doing these things and we also did the same, kind of reperformed, as they were pulling out specific CLEC bills and agreeing to them --

MR. COX: During your process analysis for billing only, were you ever given any indication by SBC that they had a problem?

MR. HORST: Not to my knowledge.

MR. COX: They never mentioned that they

had a system -- billing system problem or they were changing billing systems?

MR. HORST: We are aware there is a billing system issue out there when they did convert systems.

However, that is not necessarily something that would be captured in this performance measure.

MR. HEALY: So you said you looked at the billing, whether the rates that appeared on the bills were the rates from the rate tables? Is that what you looked at?

MR. HORST: That's right.

MR. HEALY: So you did not look at whether the bills contained the correct number of units for that rate, i.e., the correct number of new lines installed?

You just looked at whether the line installation rate was the same as the rate table?

MR. HORST: That's correct.

MR. HEALY: Did you look at whether the correct rate got put in the rate table?

MR. HORST: No, we did not.

MR. HEALY: Did you look at whether corrections or bill adjustments were applied

correctly?

MR. HORST: No.

MR. HEALY: Did you look at whether discounts were properly reflected in the rate tables? For instance, the merger condition discounts?

MR. HORST: Not to my knowledge, but again, that is not what this measure is doing.

MR. HEALY: And that is what I am trying to determine. I am trying to determine what it is not doing.

I think we did talk about what it does do.

Did you look at what the correct USOCs were being applied?

MR. HORST: Correct -- you mean --

MR. HEALY: Whether the appropriate USOC was actually being applied for the service actually ordered by the CLEC?

MR. HORST: Verifying that back to a service order.

MR. HEALY: No.

MR. COX: Was anybody from your team ever monitoring or at a six-month review session for performance measurements?

MR. HORST: No, we were not.

MR. COX: Were you aware there was some discussion about billing performance measurements being weak?

MR. HORST: Yes. We have been aware that there has been considerable amount of discussion around the billing measures, that they are not capturing what they are -- what the CLECs would like to have captured.

MR. COX: One last question about billing. What other billing types did you recognize that -- let me rephrase that.

Did you look at a specific CLEC bill when it was a UNE-related type of bill? Specific to UNE loops, for example? Unbundled Network Elements.

MR. HORST: We would have to go back and check.

MR. COX: I would just be curious if you looked at a specific CLEC bill, if the accuracy of that bill from not only the format but the accuracy of what the bill is because --

MR. BOWEN: Accuracy relative to the rate table?

MR. COX: If that's all you can compare

it with --

MR. BOWEN: That was the scope.

MR. COX: Yeah.

MR. HEALY: Do you know if all the possible rates were on the bills you looked at?

In other words, were there elements that simply were not on the sample bills that you looked at so you could not compare them back?

MR. BOWEN: I don't know if I understand the question.

MR. HEALY: The rate table contains rates for a large number of possible things a CLEC could be billed for.

Did you have occasion to examine enough CLEC bills or wide enough sample of CLEC bills so that every element that was in the rate table came out on a CLEC bill and you could compare it?

MR. HORST: Your question is to the adequacy of the company's bill audit sample, right?

And to my knowledge, I don't think we performed procedures around that.

MR. COX: Were you ever aware of any back billing?

MR. HORST: We are aware there were some

billing adjustments made.

MR. COX: And wouldn't that be a first indication there is a billing problem?

MR. HORST: Yes.

MR. COX: And were you not -- focused or scoped to look at that particular problem?

MR. HORST: We were focused on reporting that this measure as designed which is their bill out of process, what is their bill out of process finding and is that being reported?

MR. COX: So I think you are confirming that this performance measurement is not an adequate PM to capture all the billing measures and accuracies of bills, correct?

MR. HORST: That's correct.

MR. COX: So what other billing types would you have looked at or did you look at? Were there any?

Other than the rate table comparison of CABS and ACIS and what was the other one, RBS, that's the scope of what you did?

MR. HORST: That and the other performance measurements.

MR. COX: The other performance measurements for billing?

Attachment 9

> -----Original Message-----
> From: MARIS, STACEY (SBC-MSI) [mailto:sm7542@sbc.com] <mailto:[mailto:sm7542@sbc.com]>
> Sent: Friday, July 11, 2003 9:53 AM
> To: Whiteaker, Kathleen L, CSLSM; MANSIR, TERRI D (SWBT); Mickey Baeza (E-mail); Paananen, Sheila M, CSLSM
> Cc: MCGEE, CELESTE A (SWBT)
> Subject: FW: TX Att17(perf)ver0 3-6-03
>
> Kate,
> Although SBC> '> s 271 obligations, including the obligation to provide performance measurements, will cease with the expiration of the T2A, SBC continues to remain willing to provide a Performance Measures appendix. SBC has two offerings in place that AT&T may consider: 1) the Generic offering found with the Multistate ICA on the website or 2) the attached offering for the T2A Successor Project which has been available on the website since April 21. I understand from your email below that AT&T is not interested in the generic so for your convenience I have attached the T2A Successor PM documents. Terri Mansir has been assigned the responsibility for negotiating this appendix for the T2A Successor Project and is available to schedule a negotiation session with you. Please advise how you wish to proceed.
> Thanks,
> Stacey Maris
> SBC Legal
> 214-464-0228
>

Attachment 10

TABLE OF CONTENTS
PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS

Metric Number:	**Name:**
1	OSS Interface Availability

Definition:

This measures the time during which SBC Southwest's electronic OSS Interfaces for CLECs are actually available, as a percentage of scheduled availability. Because SBC Southwest and CLEC service representatives obtain information from the same underlying legacy OSS, if a particular OSS is down, it is equally unavailable to both SBC Southwest and CLEC employees.

Exclusions:

- Interface outages outside of prime time hours (as published or defined on a state-by-state basis)
- Interface outages reported by a CLEC, but not found to be in SBC Southwest's systems
- Undetected Interface outages reported by a CLEC that were not reported to SBC Southwest's designated trouble reporting center
- Scheduled interface outages for major system releases or system maintenance where CLECs were provided with advanced notification of the downtime in compliance with SBC Southwest's change management process

Business Rules:

The total "number of hours functionality to be available" is the cumulative number of hours (by date and time on a 24 hour clock) over which SWBT plans to offer and support CLEC access to SWBT's operational support systems (OSS) functionality during the reporting period. "Hours Functionality is Available" is the actual number of hours, during scheduled available time, that the SWBT interface is capable of accepting or receiving CLEC transactions or data files. The actual time available is divided by the scheduled time available and then multiplied by 100 to produce the "Percent system availability" measure. SWBT will not schedule normal maintenance during OSS Hours of availability as posted on the CLEC web site unless otherwise notified via an accessible letter. SWBT will not schedule normal maintenance during business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Monday through Friday). When interfaces experience partial unavailability, an availability factor is applied to the calculation of downtime. This factor is stated as a percentage and represents the impact to the CLEC. Determination of the availability factor is governed by SWBT's Availability Team on a case by case basis. Disputes related to application of the availability factor may be presented to the Commission. Whenever an interface experiences complete unavailability, the full duration of the unavailability will be counted, to the nearest minute, and no availability factor will be applied. SWBT shall calculate the availability time rounded to the nearest minute.

Levels of Disaggregation:

- Verigate
- LEX
- EDI ordering
- EDI pre-ordering
- EBTA

• EBTA GUI • CORBA

Calculation:	**Report Structure/Geography:**
[(Hours functionality is available during the scheduled available hours) ÷ Scheduled system available hours)] * 100	By interface geography. If an interface serves more than one state, the same performance will be reported for all states served by this interface.

Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:
99.25%

Metric Number:	**Name:**
2	Order Confirmation Timeliness

Definition:

This measures the timeliness of Order Confirmations as the percent of confirmations returned to the CLECs within specified time intervals from receipt of a valid Local Service Request ("LSR") or UNE/Interconnection Trunk Access Service Request ("ASR") to distribution of confirmations. (All service requests will be referred to as LSRs for this measure)

Exclusions:

- Orders submitted manually or by fax which are capable of being submitted electronically
- Orders that fail front-end edits (before the order is submitted to SBC Southwest)
- Rejected LSRs
- Duplicate LSR numbers
- LSR cancelled or supplemented and no confirmation is issued
- LSRs requiring special manual handling
- Test Orders
- SBC Southwest Affiliate (or separate division) Orders
- Weekend and holidays (for manual Intervention)
- Scheduled downtime hours of the service order processor and supporting systems (for electronic/electronic)
- Services ordered out of the access tariff.
- SBC Southwest only disconnect orders

Business Rules:

FOC business rules are established to reflect the Local Service Center (LSC) normal hours of operation, which include Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m, excluding holidays and weekends. If the start time is outside of normal business hours, then the start date/time is set to 8:00 a.m. on the next business day. Example: If the request is received Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.; the valid start time will be Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. If the actual request is received Monday through Thursday after 5:30 p.m. and before 8:00 a.m. the next day; the valid start time will be the next business day at 8:00 a.m. If the actual request is received Friday after 5:30 p.m. and before 8:00 a.m. Monday; the valid start time will be at 8:00 a.m. Monday. If the request is received on a holiday (anytime); the valid start time will be the next business day at 8:00 a.m. For LSRs received electronically requiring no manual intervention by the LSC, the OSS hours of operation will be used in lieu of the LSC hours of operation (i.e., actual OSS processing time outside of LSC hours will not be excluded in calculating the interval). The returned confirmation to the CLEC will establish the actual end date/time. Provisions are established within the DSS reporting systems to accommodate situations when the LSC works holidays, weekends, and when requests are received outside normal working hours. For UNE Loop and Port combinations, orders requiring N, C, and D orders; the FOC is sent back at the time the last order that establishes service is distributed.

All UNE P orders are categorized as Simple or Complex in the same manner as Retail or Resale orders are categorized. All orders that flow through EASE are categorized as Simple and all orders that do not flow through EASE are categorized as Complex.

A Mechanized Business Ordering system (MBOS) document is also required for engineering of trunks that must take place prior to the request being worked. The MBOS form must be initiated by the LSC service representative with information from the LSR for services such as Centrex, DIDs, Plexar I, Package II, Plexar II Basic, Plexar Custom Basic, and PRI services such as Smart Trunks, Select Video, etc. Once the MBOS form is completed, the LSC service representative must release it to the other involved departments for review and determination of the design information and to determine the necessary steps to provide the services. This may involve review of TN number availability, design circuit provisioning, translations requirements, etc. to determine the service availability and due date. Depending on the service and complexity of the request, the return of the MBOS could be 3-5 days. Therefore, the FOC is to be negotiated for any services that require an MBOS.

If the CLEC accesses SWBT systems using a Service Bureau Provider, the measurement of SWBT's performance does not include Service Bureau Provider processing, availability or response time.

LEX/EDI

For LEX and EDI originated LSRs, the start date and time is the receive date and time that is automatically recorded by the interface (EDI or LEX) with the system date and time. The end date and time is recorded by the interface (EDI or LEX) and reflects the actual date and time the FOC is available to the CLEC. For LSRs where FOC times are negotiated with the CLEC, the ITRAK entry on the SORD service order is used in the calculation.

MANUAL REQUESTS

Manual service order requests are those initiated by the CLEC either by telephone, fax, or other manual methods (i.e. courier). The fax receipt date and time is recorded and input on the SM-FID on each service order in SORD for each FOC opportunity. The end time is the actual date and time that a successful attempt to send a paper fax, is made back to the CLEC. If a CLEC does not require a paper fax the FOC information is provided over the phone. In these instances, the order distribution time is used as the FOC end date and time. If a CLEC chooses to receive their FOCs via the Website, the end time is the date and time the FOC is loaded to the Website. The ITRAK-FID is used when FOC times are negotiated with the CLEC. The LSC populates the ITRAK-FID with certain pre-established data entries that are used in the FOC calculation.

Levels of Disaggregation:	
• Electronic/Electronic • Manual Intervention • Interconnection Trunks	
Calculation:	**Report Structure/Geography:**
(Number of CLEC LSRs where the FOC/LSRs is sent on-time) ÷ (Number of CLEC LSRs)	**By State**
Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:	
• 95% on time for Electronic/Electronic • 85% for Manual Intervention On time standard: Simple – 24 hours Complex – 72 hours Unbundled Dedicated Transport DS1/DS3 –5 days • Local Interconnection Facilities and Trunks – 90 % within 10 business days	

Metric Number:	**Name:**
3	**Mechanized Order Completion Notification Timeliness**

Definition:

The percent of Mechanized Order Completion Notifications available within one day of work completion.

Exclusions:

- Test and Administrative Orders
- Canceled service orders
- Orders received manually, e.g. fax or e-mail
- SBC Southwest Affiliate (or separate division) Orders
- Weekends and published holidays

Business Rules:

Days are calculated by subtracting the date the SOC was available to the CLEC via EDI/LEX minus the order completion date. If the CLEC accesses SWBT systems using a Service Bureau Provider, the measurement of SWBT's performance does not include Service Bureau Provider processing, availability or response time.

Levels of Disaggregation:

- None

Calculation:	**Report Structure/Geography:**
(# mechanized completions notifications returned to the CLEC within 1 day of work completion ÷ total mechanized completions notifications) * 100	By state

Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:

95% within 1 day

Metric Number:	**Name:**
4	**Percent SBC Southwest Caused Missed Due Dates**

Definition:

This measures the percentage of orders/items completed after the committed due date. Includes only orders/items with inward activity that have an assigned due date.

Exclusions:

- Canceled service orders
- Test Orders
- Orders that are not N, T, C
- SBC Southwest Affiliate (or separate division) Orders will be excluded from the CLEC Aggregate results
- Administrative Orders
- Orders missed for facility reasons
- Due dates missed solely due to CLEC or customer reasons will be excluded from the numerator.
- NPAC caused misses, unless caused by SBC Southwest
- Excludes Interconnection Trunks

Business Rules:

The due date is the date negotiated by the customer and the SWBT representative for service activation. For CLEC orders, the due date is the due date reflected on the FOC. The Completion Date is the day that SWBT personnel complete the service order activity. POTS, UNE-P and UNE 8db loops are measured at the order level. Resale specials and UNEs are measured at the circuit level.

Levels of Disaggregation:

See Benchmarks.

Calculation:	Report Structure/Geography:
(Number of orders/circuits where the order completion date is greater than the committed due date due to SBC Southwest reasons) ÷ (Total number of orders/circuits)	By state
Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:	
POTS – (Resale RES, BUS & UNE-P) – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – OCn – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – DS3 – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – DS1 – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – DS0 (all VGPL) – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – OCn Loop (loop, transport, Darkfiber & EEL) – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – DS3 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – DS1 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – DS0 Loop (8dB, 5dB, & EEL) – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – DSL Loop (line share, no line share, & IDSL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 5%	

Metric Number:	**Name:**
5	Installation Quality

Definition:

This measures the percentage of lines/circuits installed where a reported trouble was found in the network within 10 calendar days (POTS and 8 dB UNE Loops) or 30 calendar days (all others) of order completion

Exclusions:

- SBC Southwest Affiliate (or separate division) Orders and troubles will be excluded from the CLEC Aggregate
- SBC Southwest Test and Administrative Orders
- Subsequent reports (additional customer calls while the trouble is pending)
- Troubles beyond SBC Southwest's control (e.g., CPE troubles, troubles closed due to customer action, inside wire troubles, Interexchange Carrier/Competitive Access Provider, Informational, etc.)
- Troubles reported on the Order Completion Date, or, trouble reported prior to service order completion in SBC Southwest systems
- Troubles reported but not found (Found OK, Test OK, Came Clear)
- Troubles reported by SBC Southwest employees in the course of performing preventative maintenance, where no customer has reported a trouble
- Troubles for BRI loops without test access
- Troubles for DSL loops > 12,000 feet with load coils, repeaters, and/or excessive bridged tap for which the CLEC has not authorized conditioning, unless trouble found in Central Office
- Troubles caused by a lack of digital test capabilities on BRI and IDSL capable loops when acceptance testing is available but is not selected by the CLEC
- Troubles for UNE loops caused by the lack of loop acceptance testing between the CLEC and SBC Southwest due to CLEC reasons on the due date
- DS1 troubles where CLEC chooses not to do cooperative testing
- Excludes disposition code "13" reports (excludable reports), with the exception of code 1316, unless the trouble report is taken prior to completion of the service order.(Refer to Appendix 2 for list of Excluded "13" disposition codes).
- Excludes Interconnection Trunks

Business Rules:
POTS/UNE-P Includes reports received the day after SWBT personnel complete the service order through 10 calendar days after completion. The denominator for this measure is the total count of orders posted within the reporting month. (However, the denominator will at a minimum equal the numerator). The numerator is the number of trouble reports received within 10 days of service order completion. These will be reported the month that they are closed. This will include troubles taken on the day of completion found to be as a result of a UNE-P conversion. Resale specials A trouble report is counted if it is flagged on WFA (Work Force Administration) as a trouble report that had a service order completion within 30 days. It cannot be a repeat report. The order flagged against must be an addition in order for the trouble report to be counted. Specials are selected based on a specific service code off of the circuit ID. . The denominator for this measure is the total count of orders posted within the reporting month. (However, the denominator will at a minimum equal the numerator). The numerator is the number of trouble reports received within 30 days of service order completion and closed within the reporting month. UNEs A trouble report is counted if it is received within "X" calendar days, where "X" is 10 calendar days for 8db loops and 30 calendar days for all other UNEs, calendar days of a service order completion. UNEs are selected based on a specific service code off of the circuit ID. This measurement is reported at a circuit level. The denominator for this measure is the total count of circuits posted within the reporting month. (However, the denominator will at a minimum equal the numerator). The numerator is the number of trouble reports received within "X" calendar days where "X" is 10 calendar days for 8db loops and 30 calendar days for all other UNEs, calendar days of service order completion that were closed during the reporting month.
Levels of Disaggregation:
See Benchmarks

Calculation:	**Report Structure/Geography:**
Number of trouble reports submitted within 10/30 days of installation activity with trouble found in the network ÷ orders/circuits installed in the calendar month	By state

Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:
POTS – (Resale RES, BUS & UNE-P) – parity with retail Specials Resale – OCn – parity with retail Specials Resale – DS3 – parity with retail Specials Resale – DS1 – parity with retail Specials Resale – DS0 (all VGPL) – parity with retail

Specials Resale – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail
UNE Loop – OCn Loop (loop, transport, Darkfiber & EEL) – parity with retail
UNE Loop – DS3 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity with retail
UNE Loop – DS1 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity with retail
UNE Loop – DS0 Loop (8dB, 5dB, & EEL) – parity with retail
UNE Loop – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail
UNE Loop – DSL Loop (line share, no line share, & IDSL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 5%

Metric Number:	**Name:**
6	Trouble Report Rate

Definition:

Measurement of customer direct or referred troubles reported — other than installation troubles or repeat troubles — where the trouble disposition was found to be in the network, per 100 lines/circuits in service.

Exclusions:

- SBC Southwest Affiliate (or separate division) troubles and lines will be excluded from the CLEC aggregate
- Subsequent reports (additional customer calls while the trouble is pending)
- Troubles beyond SBC Southwest's control (e.g., CPE troubles, troubles closed due to customer action, inside wire troubles, Interexchange Carrier/Competitive Access Provider, Informational, etc.)
- SBC Southwest Test and Administrative Troubles
- Troubles reported by SBC Southwest employees in the course of performing preventative maintenance, where no customer has reported a trouble
- Troubles reported, but not found (e.g., Found OK, Test OK & Came Clear)
- Troubles for BRI loops without test access
- Troubles for DSL loops > 12,000 feet with load coils, repeaters, and/or excessive bridged tap for which the CLEC has not authorized conditioning, unless trouble found in Central Office
- Troubles caused by a lack of digital test capabilities on BRI and IDSL capable loops when acceptance testing is available but is not selected by the CLEC
- Excludes all disposition "13" reports (excludable reports), with the exception of code 1316, unless the report is taken prior to completion of the service order. (Refer to Appendix 2 for list of Excluded "13" disposition codes).
- Stand alone Interconnection Trunks (Specials)

Business Rules

Reports are counted in the month they are reported.

Levels of Disaggregation:

See Benchmarks

Calculation:	**Report Structure/Geography:**
[Total number of qualifying trouble reports ÷ (Number of lines/circuits in service ÷ 100)]	By state
Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:	
POTS – (Resale RES, BUS & UNE-P) – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – OCn – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – DS3 – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – DS1 – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – DS0 (all VGPL) – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail	
UNES Loop – OCn Loop (loop, transport, Darkfiber & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 2%	
UNES Loop – DS3 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 2%	
UNES Loop – DS1 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 2%	
UNES Loop – DS0 Loop (8dB, 5dB, & EEL) – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail	
UNES Loop – DSL Loop (line share, no line share, & IDSL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 3%	

Metric Number:	**Name:**
7	Repeat Trouble Report Rate

Definition:

Percentage of additional reported/cleared Network trouble that had a Network trouble cleared within the previous 30 days.

Exclusions:

- Excludes disposition code "13" reports (excludable reports), with the exception of code 1316, unless the report is taken prior to the completion of the service order.
- Interconnection Trunks
- Reported by SBC Southwest employees in the course of performing preventative maintenance, where no customer has reported a trouble
- Troubles beyond the SBC Southwest control(e.g., CPE troubles, troubles closed due to customer action, inside wire troubles, Interexchange Carrier/Competitive Access Provider, Informational, etc.)
- Troubles reported on the Order Completion Date, or, trouble reported prior to service order completion in SBC Southwest systems
- Subsequent reports (additional customer calls while the trouble is pending)
- Troubles reported but not found (e.g. Found OK, Test OK, Came Clear)
- Troubles reported by SBC Southwest employees in the course of performing preventative maintenance, where no customer reported a trouble
- SBC Southwest official or administrative orders
- Troubles for BRI loops without test access
- Troubles for DSL loops > 12,000 feet with load coils, repeaters, and/or excessive bridged tap for which the CLEC has not authorized conditioning, unless trouble found in Central Office
- Troubles caused by a lack of digital test capabilities on BRI and IDSL capable loops when acceptance testing is available but is not selected by the CLEC

Business Rules:

A repeat trouble report is defined as a trouble on the same line/circuit as a previous trouble report (as reported in the installation quality or trouble report rate measurements) that occurred within the last X calendar days (10 days for POTS, UNE-P and 30 days for UNEs and resale specials) of the previous trouble. When the second report is received in X days, the original report is marked as an Original of a Repeat, and the second report is marked as a Repeat. If a third report is received within X days, the second report is marked as an Original of a Repeat as well as being a Repeat, and the third report is marked as a Repeat. In this case there would be two repeat reports. If either

the original or the second report within X days is a measured report, then the second report counts as a Repeat report.
Levels of Disaggregation:
See Benchmarks

Calculation:	**Report Structure/Geography:**
Number of qualifying network troubles ÷ total network troubles found within the calendar month	By state

Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:
POTS – (Resale RES, BUS & UNE-P) – parity with retail
Specials Resale – OCn – parity with retail
Specials Resale – DS3 – parity with retail
Specials Resale – DS1 – parity with retail
Specials Resale – DS0 (all VGPL) – parity with retail
Specials Resale – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail
UNE Loop – OCn Loop (loop, transport, Darkfiber & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 10%
UNE Loop – DS3 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 10%
UNE Loop – DS1 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 10%
UNE Loop – DS0 Loop (8dB, 5dB, & EEL) – parity with retail
UNE Loop – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail
UNE Loop – DSL Loop (line share, no line share, & IDSL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 9%

Metric Number:	**Name:**
8	Mean Time to Restore

Definition:

This measures the average trouble duration interval from trouble receipt to trouble clearance.

Exclusions:

- SBC Southwest Affiliate (or separate division) troubles are excluded from the CLEC aggregate
- Subsequent reports (additional customer calls while the trouble is pending)
- Troubles beyond SBC Southwest's control (e.g., CPE troubles, troubles closed due to customer action, inside wire troubles, Interexchange Carrier/Competitive Access Provider, Informational, etc.)
- Troubles reported but not found (Found OK ,Test OK and Came Clear)
- Troubles reported by employees in the course of performing preventative maintenance, where no customer reported a trouble
- For troubles where the stop clock is used, the time period from when the stop clock is initiated until the time when the clock resumes
- Troubles for BRI loops without test access
- Troubles for DSL loops > 12,000 feet with load coils, repeaters, and/or excessive bridged tap for which the CLEC has not authorized conditioning, unless trouble found in Central Office
- Troubles caused by a lack of digital test capabilities on BRI and IDSL capable loops when acceptance testing is available but is not selected by the CLEC
- Excludes disposition code "13" reports (excludable reports), with the exception of code 1316, unless the report is taken prior to the completion of the service order.
- No access and delayed maintenance

Business Rules:	
Trouble duration intervals may be measured on a running clock or limited stop-clock basis. Running clock includes weekends and holidays. A limited stop clock may be used on Specials Resale and UNES loop products when the customer premises access or access to the circuit, provided by the CLEC and its end user, is after the offered repair interval. A running clock is used for POTS and UNE-P. For example, if customer premises access is not available on a weekend, the clock stops at 5:00 p.m. Friday, and resumes at 8:00 a.m. Monday. This applies to dispatched out tickets only. The clock starts on the date and time SWBT receives a trouble report. The clock stops on the date and time that SWBT personnel clear the repair activity and complete the trouble report in WFA.	
Levels of Disaggregation:	
See Benchmarks	
Calculation:	**Report Structure/Geography:**
Σ[(Date and time trouble report is cleared with the customer) - (date and time trouble report is received)] ÷ total network customer trouble reports	By state
Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:	
POTS – (Resale RES, BUS & UNE-P) – parity with retail Specials Resale – OCn – parity with retail Specials Resale – DS3 – parity with retail Specials Resale – DS1 – parity with retail Specials Resale – DS0 (all VGPL) – parity with retail Specials Resale – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail UNE Loop – OCn Loop (loop, transport, Darkfiber & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 3.0 hours UNE Loop – DS3 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 3.0 hours UNE Loop – DS1 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 4.0 hours UNE Loop – DS0 Loop (8dB, 5dB, & EEL) – parity with retail UNE Loop – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail UNE Loop – DSL Loop (line share, no line share, & IDSL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 9.0 hours	

Attachment 7

Attachment D-WI

Legend for the Wisconsin Blind Replication* Status Summary as of June 4, 2003**

Column Heading	Definition	Possible Entries	Entry Descriptions
Performance Measurement	The performance measurement number and name as assigned in the published metrics business rules v1.8.		
Product Disaggregation	The associated sub-metrics as defined in the published metrics business rules v1.8. This status summary presents blind replication progress (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for the product-level disaggregations reported by SBC Midwest. SBC Midwest is required to report geographic disaggregations for some of these performance measures, as defined in the published metrics business rules. BearingPoint evaluates each of the disaggregations that SBC Midwest is required to report.		Example: % Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – Field Work
July 2002, August 2002, September 2002 *The test is being conducted using the February 5, 2003 posted results for the July 2002, August 2002 and September 2002 data months.*	CLEC Value - indicates whether BearingPoint-calculated values match SBC Midwest-reported aggregate CLEC values within +/- one percent (inclusive). SBC Midwest Value - indicates whether BearingPoint-calculated values match SBC Midwest-reported retail values within +/- one percent (inclusive). This status summary presents blind replication progress (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for CLEC values and retail values (or retail affiliate values, where noted) reported by SBC Midwest for the state of Wisconsin. (The reported values for a performance measure may include a CLEC numerator, a CLEC denominator, a CLEC value, a retail value, a retail affiliate value, a benchmark and a z-value for each disaggregation, as defined in the published metrics business rules.)	M (Match)	Reported values and independently-calculated values agree within +/- one percent (inclusive).
		NM (Non Match)	A discrepancy of +/- five percent or more; or a discrepancy of between +/- one and five percent that would, if corrected, cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse.
		NMM (Non Material Match)	A discrepancy that would, if corrected, change the original reported performance measurement result by between +/- one and five percent; and would not, if corrected, cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse.
		Blank	The evaluation of the reported value is not complete.
Status	The status of blind replication (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") for this disaggregation.	Not Started	The evaluation of the reported value has not begun.
		In Progress	The evaluation of the reported value is in progress.
		Completed	The evaluation of the reported value is complete.
Complete Date	The date on which blind replication (evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") was completed.	Date	The evaluation for the reported value was completed on the date provided.
		Blank	The evaluation of the reported value is not complete.
Comments	Published Observations and Exceptions numbers (see www.osstesting.com) pertinent to the corresponding disaggregation, along with the type of discrepancy (i.e., calculation (PMR5-2), business rule (PMR5-3), or exclusion (PMR5-4)) are noted.		
Footnotes	Notes to assist with interpretation of this status summary.		

** "Blind Replication" refers to evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree."*
*** Blind replication status is reported as of June 4, 2003, unless otherwise noted.*

SELECTED SBC MIDWEST PERFORMANCE MEASURES

PRE-ORDERING
1.2 - Average Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders

ORDERING
5 - Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOCs) Returned within "X" Hours
7 - Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System
9 - Percent Rejects
10 - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR
10.1 - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order
10.2 - Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours
10.3 - Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours
10.4 - Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices
11 - Mean Time to Return Rejects
11.1 - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface
11.2 - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received through the Manual Process
13 - Order Process Percent Flow-Through

PROVISIONING
12 - Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy
27 - Mean Installation Interval
28 - Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date
29 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale POTS)
35 - Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation
45 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations)
56 - Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date
56.1 - Percent Installations Completed With the Customer Requested Due Date for Loop With LNP
58 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Unbundled Network Elements)

MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR
37 - Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS)
37.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
38 - Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS)
39 - Receipt to Clear Duration
40 - Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours (Resale POTS)
41 - Percent Repeat Reports (Resale POTS)
54.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports
67 - Mean Time to Restore (Unbundled Network Elements)

BILLING
14 - Billing Accuracy
17 - Billing Completeness
18 - Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)
19 - Daily Usage Feed Timeliness

INTERCONNECTION TRUNKS
73 - Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks
78 - Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval

LOCAL NUMBER PORTABILITY
91 - Percent of LNP Due Dates with Industry Guidelines
96 - Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders

DIRECTORY ASSISTANCE DATABASE
110 - Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs

COORDINATED CONVERSION
114 - Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers)
114.1 - CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval
115 - Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers
115.1 - Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports
MI 3 - Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval

OTHER
MI 9 - Percentage Missing FOCs
MI 11 - Average Interface Outage Notification
MI 13 - Percent Loss Notification within One Hour of Service Order Completion
MI 14 - Percent Completion Notifications Returned within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
Pre-Ordering Metrics												
1.2[6] - Average Accuracy of Actual Loop Makeup Information Provided for DSL Orders	1	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Manually	NM						In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR119 **Business Rule Discrepancies:** O697 (closed unresolved)	
	2	Accuracy of Actual LMU Info Provided for DSL Orders Electronically	M						In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O697 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Pre-Ordering Metrics - Total Non Matches			1	0	0	0	0	0				
Ordering Metrics												
5[4] - Percent Firm Order Confirmations (FOC) Returned Within "X" Hours (Evaluated as of 6/16/03)	3	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	4	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines) -MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	5	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	6	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	7	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	8	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	9	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	10	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	11	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	12	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	13	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	14	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	15	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	16	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	17	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	18	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	19	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	20	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	21	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	22	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	23	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	24	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	25	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	26	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	27	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	28	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	29	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (>= 5 DS1) -	M		M				In Progress			
	30	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1 - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	31	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3 - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	32	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	33	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	34	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	35	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	36	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 hrs - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	37	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	38	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	39	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	40	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	41	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	42	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	43	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	44	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	45	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	46	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	47	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	48	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	49	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	50	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	51	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	52	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	53	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	54	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	55	% FOCs Returned within 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	56	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress			
	57	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	58	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (1 - 200 Lines) -ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	59	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	60	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (1 - 49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	61	% FOCs Returned within 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	62	% FOCs Returned within 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	63	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
	64	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	65	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE Loop (>= 50 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	66	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (1 - 19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	67	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	68	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	69	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	70	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	71	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	72	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Man Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	73	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Simple Res & Bus - LNP Only (20+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	74	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP w/Loop (20+ Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	75	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (1 - 19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	76	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (20-50 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	77	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Clock Hrs - Elec Sub Req - LNP Complex Bus (50+ Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	78	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	79	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	80	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	81	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - CIA Centrex (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	82	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Days - Man & Elec Sub Req - Interconnection Trunks (<5 DS1) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	83	% FOCs Returned w/in 8 Days-Man & Elec Sub Req-Interconnection Trunks (>= 5 DS1) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	84	% FOCs Returned w/in 1 Bus Day - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS1 - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	85	% FOCs Returned 5 Bus Days - Elec Sub Req - Unbundled Local (Dedicated) Transport - DS3 - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	86	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	87	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	88	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	89	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	90	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (1-19 Lps) < 6 hrs - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	91	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE xDSL Cpbl Lp (>19 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	92	% FOCs Returned w/in 6 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (1-49 Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	93	% FOCs Returned w/in 14 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Line Sharing (50+ Lps) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	94	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	95	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	96	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Man Sub Req - UNE P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	97	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	98	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE Loop (1-49 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	99	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	100	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Switch Ports - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	101	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	102	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787	
	103	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	104	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - UNE-P Simple Res & Bus - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	105	% FOCs Returned w/in 24 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (1-200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	106	% FOCs Returned w/in 48 Hrs - Elec Sub Req - UNE-P Complex Bus (> 200 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	107	% FOCs Returned w/in 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	108	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - Simple Res & Bus-LNP Only (1-19 Lines) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	109	% FOCs Returned within 2 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Elec Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
	110	% FOCs Returned w/in 5 Bus Hrs - Elec Sub Req - Man Prcsd - LNP w/Loop (1-19 Loops) - ICS/DSS							Not Started			
7[5] - Percent Mechanized Completions Returned Within One Hour of Completion in Ordering System	111	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - Combinations							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O659v2 (closed unresolved), O429v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O854	
	112	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - Resale							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O659v2 (closed unresolved), O429v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O787, O854	
	113	% Mechanized Completions Returned Within 1 Hour of Completion in Ordering Systems - UNE							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O659v2 (closed unresolved), O429v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O854	
9[4] - Percent Rejects	114	% CLEC Caused Rejects - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O688v2 (closed unresolved)	
	115	% Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 *(closed unresolved)* **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O688v2 (closed unresolved)	
	116	% CLEC Caused Rejects - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O688v2 (closed unresolved)	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
	117	% Ameritech Caused Rejects (Re-flowed Orders) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O688v2 (closed unresolved)	
10[4] - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR	118	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR - MOR/Tel							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O823 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O803 (closed	
	119	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Reject in MOR - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O823 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O803 (closed	
10.1[4] - Percent Mechanized Rejects Returned Within One Hour of Receipt of Order	120	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
	121	% Mechanized Rejects Returned within 1 Hour of Receipt of Order - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
10.2[4] - Percent Manual Rejects Received Electronically and Returned Within Five Hours	122	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned within 5 Hours - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
	123	% Manual Rejects Received Electronically & Returned within 5 Hours - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
10.3[4] - Percent Manual Rejects Received Manually and Returned Within Five Hours	124	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned within 5 Hours - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
	125	% Manual Rejects Received Manually & Returned within 5 Hours - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
10.4[5] - Percent of Orders Given Jeopardy Notices	126	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – Field Work							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	127	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Residential – No Field Work							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	128	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Business – Field Work							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	129	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - POTS – Business – No Field Work							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	130	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Special – Field Work							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	131	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Resale Special – No Field Work							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	132	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loop with LNP							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	133	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Loop without LNP							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	134	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - Unbundled Local Switching							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	
	135	% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices - UNE-P							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O756v2 (closed unresolved), O676v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O687v2, O725	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
		% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices -- Resale POTS -- FW							In Progress			
		% Orders Given Jeopardy Notices -- Resale POTS -- NFW							In Progress			
11[4] - Mean Time to Return Rejects	136	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (hours) - MOR/Tel							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O643v2 (closed unresolved), O809 (closed unresolved), O756v2 (closed unresolved), O823 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O584v2 (closed unresolved), O803 (closed unresolved)	
	137	Mean Time to Return Mechanized Rejects (hours) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O809 (closed unresolved), O756v2 (closed unresolved), O823 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O584v2 (closed unresolved), O803 (closed unresolved)	
11.1[4] - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Interface	138	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (hours) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O643v2 (closed unresolved), O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
	139	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received via an Electronic Interface (hours) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
11.2[4] - Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received through the Manual Process	140	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (hours) - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O643v2 (closed unresolved), O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
	141	Mean Time to Return Manual Rejects that are Received thru the Manual Process (hours) - ICS/DSS							Not Started		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O727 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O755	
13[4] - Order Process Percent Flow-Through	142	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LNP - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	143	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LSNP - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	144	Order Process Percent Flow Through - Resale - MOR/Tel	M		M				In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	145	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops - MOR/Tel	M		M						**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	146	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE-P - MOR/Tel	M		M						**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O488v3 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	147	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LNP - ICS/DSS							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	148	Order Process Percent Flow Through - LSNP - ICS/DSS							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	149	Order Process Percent Flow Through - Resale - ICS/DSS							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	150	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE Loops - ICS/DSS							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
	151	Order Process Percent Flow Through - UNE-P - ICS/DSS							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O488v3 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O746 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Ordering Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0	0	0				
Provisioning Metrics												
12 - Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	152	Mechanized Provisioning Accuracy	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/16/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O794 (closed unresolved)	
27 - Mean Installation Interval (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	153	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	154	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	155	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	156	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - CIA Centrex No FW	M		M		M		Completed	4/24/2003		
	157	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
	158	Mean Installation Interval - POTS - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	159	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	160	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	161	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	162	Mean Installation Interval - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
28 - Percent POTS/UNE-P Installations Completed Within the Customer Requested Due Date (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	163	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	164	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	165	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	166	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - CIA Centrex No FW	M	[redacted]	M	[redacted]	M	[redacted]	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	167	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	168	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - POTS - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	169	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	170	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	171	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Projects	M	[redacted]	M	[redacted]	M	[redacted]	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	172	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Res FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
	173	% Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O739	
29 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale POTS) (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	174	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus Fw	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	175	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Bus No FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	176	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	177	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - POTS - Res No FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	178	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Bus FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	179	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Bus No FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	180	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Res FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
	181	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE P - Res No FW	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O628v2 (closed unresolved)	
35 - Percent Trouble Reports Within 30 Days (I-30) of Installation (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	182	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - FW	M	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	183	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Bus - No FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	184	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	185	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - POTS - Res - No FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	186	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	187	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Bus - No FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	188	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
	189	% Trouble Reports Within 30 Days of Install - UNE-P Res - No FW	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR126	
45 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Resale Specials and UNE Loop and Port Combinations)	190	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DDS	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	191	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DS1	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	192	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - DS3	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	193	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	194	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - ISDN PRI	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	195	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - Other	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	196	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - VGPL	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	197	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	198	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - ISDN PRI	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	199	% Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates - Design - UNE Loop and Port - Other	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
56 - Percent Installations Completed Within Customer Requested Due Date	200	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (1-10) -- 3 Days	[redacted]				M	[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	201	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (11-20) -- 7 Days	[redacted]				M	[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	202	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Analog (20+) -- 10 Days	[redacted]				M	[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	203	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (1-10) -- 3 Days	[redacted]				M	[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	204	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (11-20) -- 7 Days	[redacted]				M	[redacted]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
	205	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - 2 Wire Digital (20+) -- 10 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	206	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	207	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	208	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS0 (20+) and all other types -- ICB					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	209	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	210	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	211	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS1 (20+) and all other types -- ICB					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	212	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (1 to 10) -- 3 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	213	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (11 to 20) -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	214	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Dedicated Transport DS3 (20+) and all other types -- ICB					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	215	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 loop (includes PRI) -- 3 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	216	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (1 to 10) -- 3 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	217	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (11 to 20) -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	218	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DS1 Trunk Port (20+) -- ICB					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	219	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with Line Sharing		M[5]		M[5]	M	M[5]	In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	220	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with no Line Sharing -- Conditioned -- 10 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	221	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - DSL with no Line Sharing -- Non Conditioned -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	222	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- Analog Port -- 2 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	223	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- BRI Port (1-50) -- 3 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	224	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- BRI Port (50+) -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	225	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- PRI Port (1-20) -- 5 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	226	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Switch Ports -- PRI Port (20+) -- 10 Days					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	227	% Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - UNE Loop Projects					M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
56.1 - Percent Installations Completed With the Customer Requested Due Date for Loop With LNP	228	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (1-10)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	229	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (11-20)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	230	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Aggregate Loop w/LNP (20+)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	231	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (1-10)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	232	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (11-20)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	233	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - CHC Loop w/LNP (20+)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	234	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (1-10)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	235	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (11-20)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	236	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - FDT Loop w/LNP (20+)					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
	237	% (UNE) Installs Cmpltd w/in Cust Req DD - Loop w/LNP Projects					M		Completed	3/26/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O729	
58 - Percent Ameritech Caused Missed Due Dates (Unbundled Network Elements)	238	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (FW)	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	239	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (FW)	NM	M					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O613v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	**BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 613v4 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-03		August-03		September-03		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
	240	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Analog Trunk Port	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	241	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access	NM	M					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O613v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	**BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 613v4 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**
	242	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Broadband DSL w/Line Sharing	M	M[8]					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	243	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Broadband DSL w/out Line sharing	M						In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	244	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Dark Fiber	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	245	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	246	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access	M	M					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O613v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	**BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 613v4 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**
	247	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	248	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loops w/Line Sharing	M	M[8]					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	249	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - DSL Loopsw/out Line sharing	NMM						In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O613v4 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	**BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 613v4 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**
	250	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - ISDN BRI Port	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	251	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D)	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	252	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B)	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
	253	% AIT Caused Missed Due Dates - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks	M	M					In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O711 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Provisioning Metrics - Total Non Matches			9	8	0	0	0	0				
Maintenance and Repair Metrics												
37 - Trouble Report Rate (Resale POTS) (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	254	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Bus	NMM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O627v3	
	255	Trouble Report Rate - POTS - Res	NMM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O627v3	
	256	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Bus	NM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O627v3	
	257	Trouble Report Rate - UNE-P Res	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O627v3	
37.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	258	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	M	M					In Progress			
	259	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O639v3	
	260	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - UNE-P - Bus	NM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O639v3	
	261	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Reports - UNE-P - Res	NM	NM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O639v3	
38 - Percent Missed Repair Commitments (Resale POTS) (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	262	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - Dispatch							In Progress			
	263	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch							In Progress			
	264	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - Dispatch		M					In Progress			
	265	% Missed Repair Commitments - POTS - Res - No Dispatch	M						In Progress			
	266	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch							In Progress			
	267	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch							In Progress			
	268	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - Dispatch	M	M					In Progress			
	269	% Missed Repair Commitments - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch							In Progress			
39 - Receipt to Clear Duration (Evaluated as of 6/10/03)	270	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	271	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NMM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	272	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	273	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NMM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	274	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	275	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NMM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	276	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	277	Receipt to Clear Duration - POTS - Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NM	NMM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	278	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	M	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	279	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NMM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	280	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	281	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Bus - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	282	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	283	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NMM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	284	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Affecting Service (hours)	NM	NM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
	285	Receipt to Clear Duration - UNE-P Res - No Dispatch - Out of Service (hours)	NM	NMM	M	M			In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O858	
40 - Percent Out of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours	286	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - POTS - Business	NMM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR121	
	287	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - POTS - Residence	NMM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR121	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
< 24 Hours (Resale POTS)	288	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - UNE-P Bus	NMM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR121	
	289	Percent Out Of Service (OOS) < 24 Hours - UNE-P Res	NM	NMM					In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** NR121	
41 - Percent Repeat Reports (Resale POTS) (Evaluated as of 6/11/03)	290	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Bus	NM	NM	M	M	M	M	In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O862	
	291	% Repeat Reports - POTS - Res	NM	NM	M	M	M	M	In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O862	
	292	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Bus	NM	NM	M	M	M	M	In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O862	
	293	% Repeat Reports - UNE-P Res	NM	NM	M	M	M	M	In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O862	
54.1 - Trouble Report Rate Net of Installation and Repeat Reports	294	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DDS	M	M					In Progress			
	295	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DS1	M						In Progress			
	296	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - DS3	M	M					In Progress			
	297	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress			
	298	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - ISDN PRI	M						In Progress			
	299	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - Other Services	M	M					In Progress			
	300	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - Resale - Voice Grade Private Line	M						In Progress			
	301	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN BRI	M	M					In Progress			
	302	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - ISDN PRI	M	M					In Progress			
	303	Trouble Report Rate Net of Install & Repeat Rpts - UNE Loop & Port - Other Services	M	M					In Progress			
67 - Mean Time to Restore (Unbundled Network Elements)	304	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	305	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	306	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							***Business Rule Discrepancies:*** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	307	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - 8.0 dB Loop without Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	308	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	309	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Analog Trunk Port (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	310	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	311	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - BRI Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	312	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - Dispatch (hours)	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	313	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - Line Sharing - No Dispatch (hours)	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	314	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - Dispatch (hours)	M								**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	315	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Broadband DSL - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch (hours)	M								**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	316	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	317	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Dark Fiber (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	318	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	319	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Dedicated Transport (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	320	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	321	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS1 Loop with Test Access (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	322	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	323	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DS3 Dedicated Transport (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	324	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - Line Sharing - Dispatch	M	M							***Business Rule Discrepancies:*** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	325	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - Line Sharing - No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	326	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - No Line Sharing - Dispatch	M								**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	327	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - DSL Loops (hours) - No Line Sharing - No Dispatch	M								**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	328	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	329	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - ISDN BRI Port (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
	330	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D) (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	331	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (1D) (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	332	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	333	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Channel (23B) (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	334	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks (hours)-Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
	335	Mean Time to Restore - UNE - Subtending Digital Direct Combination Trunks (hours)-No Dispatch	M	M							**Business Rule Discrepancies:** E111 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Maintenance and Repair Metrics - Total Non Matches			19	22	0	0	0	0				
Billing Metrics												
14 - Billing Accuracy (Evaluated as of 6/19/03)	336	Billing Accuracy - Resale Monthly Recurring/Non-recurring	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/24/2003		
	337	Billing Accuracy - Resale Usage / Unbundled Local Switching	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	6/19/2003		
	338	Billing Accuracy - Other UNEs	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	3/21/2003		
17 - Billing Completeness	339	Billing Completeness	M	M	M	M	M	M	Completed	4/30/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O731 (closed unresolved)	
18 - Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill)	340	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill) - AEBS	M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	**Exclusions Discrepancies:** O845	**O845 is closed unresolved.**
	341	Billing Timeliness (Wholesale Bill) - CABS	M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	**Exclusions Discrepancies:** O845	**O845 is closed unresolved.**
19 - Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	342	Daily Usage Feed Timeliness	M		M		M		Completed	2/12/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O694v2 (closed unresolved), O846	**Observation 846 is closed unresolved.**
Selected Billing Metrics - Total Non Matches			0	0	0	0	0	0				
Interconnection Trunk Metrics												
73 - Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks	343	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - 911	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003		
	344	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - Interconnection Trunks (Non-projects)	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003		
	345	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - OS/DA	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003		
	346	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - Projects	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003		
	347	Percentage Missed Due Dates - Interconnection Trunks - SS7	M		M		M		Completed	5/10/2003		
78 - Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval	348	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - 911 Trunks (days)	M		M		M		In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O719 (closed unresolved)	
	349	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - Interconnection Trunks (days)	M		M		NM		In Progress		**Calculation Discrepancies:** O824 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O719 (closed unresolved)	
	350	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - OS/DA (days)	M		M		M		*In Progress*		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O719 (closed unresolved)	
	351	Average Interconnection Trunk Installation Interval - SS7 Links (days)	M		M		M		In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O719 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Interconnection Trunk Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		1					
LNP Metrics												
91[5] - Percent of LNP Due Dates with Industry Guidelines	352	% of LNP Only Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines - Complete							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O732, O756v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O834 (closed unresolved), O835 (closed unresolved)	
	353	% of LNP Only Due Dates Within Industry Guidelines - Partials - NXX (1-100 TNs)							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O732, O756v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O834 (closed unresolved), O835 (closed unresolved)	
96 - Percentage Pre-mature Disconnects for LNP Orders	354	% Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP only	M						In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O710	**BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 710 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**
	355	% Premature Disconnects for LNP Orders - LNP with Loop	M						In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O710	**BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 710 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**
Selected LNP Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		0					
Directory Assistance Database Metrics												
110 - Percentage of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs	356	% of Updates Completed into the DA Database within 72 Hours for Facility Based CLECs	M		M		M		Completed	2/19/2003	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O689 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Directory Assistance Database Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		0					
Coordinated Conversions Metrics												

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
114 - Percentage of Premature Disconnects (Coordinated Cutovers) (Evaluated as of 4/28/03)	357	% Premature Disconnects - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O631v2, O815 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	**Observation 631v2 is closed unresolved.**
	358	% Premature Disconnects - FDT	NM[7]		NM[7]		NM[7]		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O570v2 (closed unresolved), O815 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
114.1 - CHC/FDT LNP with Loop Provisioning Interval	359	Provisioning Interval - CHC-LNP with Loop <10 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002		
	360	Provisioning Interval - CHC-LNP with Loop 10-24 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002		
	361	Provisioning Interval - FDT-LNP with Loop <10 lines	M		NM[7]		M		Completed	11/20/2002		
	362	Provisioning Interval - FDT-LNP with Loop 10-24 lines	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002		
115 - Percentage of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers	363	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>30 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O631v2, O677v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
	364	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>60 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O631v2, O677v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
	365	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - CHC-LNP with UNE Loop>120 Minutes	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O631v2, O677v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
	366	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>30 Minutes	M		NM[7]		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O570v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
	367	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>60 Minutes	M		NM[7]		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O570v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
	368	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutovers - FDT-LNP with UNE Loop>120 Minutes	M		NM[7]		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O570v2 (closed unresolved) **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
115.1 - Percent Provisioning Trouble Reports	369	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O738 (closed unresolved), O722 (closed unresolved)	
	370	% of Ameritech Caused Delayed Coordinated Cutover - FDT	M		NM[7]		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O738 (closed unresolved), O722 (closed unresolved)	
MI13 - Coordinated Conversions Outside of the Interval	371	Coordinated Conversions Outside of Interval - CHC	M		M		M		Completed	11/20/2002	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O631v2 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O722 (closed unresolved)	
Selected Coordinated Conversions Metrics - Total Non Matches			1		6		1					
Other Metrics												
MI 9[5] - Percentage Missing FOCs	372	% Missing FOCs - Resale							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O792 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	
	373	% Missing FOCs - UNE (Loops, LNP, and LSNP)							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O792 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	
	374	% Missing FOCs - UNE-P							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O792 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	
MI11 - Average Interface Outage Notification	375	Average Interface Outage Notification (Minutes)	M		M		M		Completed	4/16/2003	**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O624v2, O594 (closed unresolved)	**Observation 624v2 is closed unresolved for July and August.**
MI 13[5] - Percent Loss Notification within One Hour of Service Order Completion	376	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - Resale							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	
	377	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE Loops							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	
	378	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - LNP							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	
	379	% Loss Notifications within 1 Hour of Service Order Completion - UNE P							In Progress		**Exclusion Discrepancies:** O661v2, O787	

Performance Measurement	REF #	Product Disaggregation	July-02		August-02		September-02		Status[2]	Complete Date	Comments[3]	Additional Unresolved Observations
			CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1	CLEC Value[1]	SBC Midwest Value1				
MI14 - Percent Completion Notifications Returned within "X" Hours of Completion of Maintenance Trouble Ticket	380	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Manual - Next Day	M						In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O642v2, O847 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O637v2	**Observation 847 is Closed Unresolved. BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 637v2 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03 BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 642v2 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**
	381	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - Resale Electronic < 1 hour							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O847, O848	**Observation 847 is Closed Unresolved. Observation 848 is Closed Unresolved**
	382	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Manual - Next Day	M		M		M		In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O847 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O637v2	**Observation 847 is Closed Unresolved. Observation 848 is Closed Unresolved. BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 637v2 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**
	383	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE Loops Electronic < 1 hour							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O847, O848	**Observation 847 is Closed Unresolved. Observation 848 is Closed Unresolved**
	384	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Manual - Next Day	M						In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O642v2, O847 **Exclusion Discrepancies:** O637v2	**Observation 847 is Closed Unresolved. BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 637v2 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03 BearingPoint testing activities for Observation 642v2 are scheduled for completion by 9/30/03**
	385	% Cmpltion Notfctns Rtrnd within "X" Hours of Cmpltn of Mntnce Trble Tckt - UNE P Electronic < 1 hour							In Progress		**Business Rule Discrepancies:** O847, O848	**Observation 847 is Closed Unresolved. Observation 848 is Closed Unresolved.**
Selected Other Metrics - Total Non Matches			0		0		0					
ALL Selected Metrics - Total Non Matches			30	30	6	0	2	0				

Footnotes:
1. A "Non-Material Match (NMM)" as recorded in this chart is indicated when a value did not match within +/- 1 percent (inclusive), but the difference between reported and independently-calculated values was between +/- 1 and 5 percent and did not cause the performance measurement's original reported parity attainment/failure or benchmark attainment/failure to reverse. It is noted that the materiality threshold applied in "blind replication" (i.e., the evaluation criterion type PMR5-2, "SBC Midwest-reported and BearingPoint-calculated metrics values agree") in BearingPoint's OSS test is +/- 1 percent.
2. "Status" applies to the status of "blind replication" (i.e., evaluation criterion type PMR5-2) progress for the disaggregation in the OSS test.
3. Published Observations and Exceptions numbers (see www.osstesting.com) pertinent to the corresponding disaggregation, along with the type of discrepancy (i.e., calculation, business rule, or exclusion) are noted.
4. The reporting of this performance measurement was transitioned from MOR/Tel to ICS/DSS during the test. The calculation of this performance measurement is based on data from both of these systems. For this reason, a distinction has been made in this chart between the "blind replication" status of the MOR/Tel data component and the ICS/DSS data component for this performance measure.
5. The reporting of this performance measurement was transtioned from MOR/Tel to ICS/DSS during the test. SBC Midwest calculates this performance measure using only ICS/DSS data.
6. The "SBC Affiliate" values are used as the retail component for parity comparison in the performance measurement. As such, the "SBC Midwest" column has been populated with the "blind replication" status of the "SBC Midwest Affiliate" values.
7. SBC Midwest has restated this value for this performance measure disaggregation.
8. In this disaggregation, the "SBC Midwest Affiliate" value is used as the retail component for parity comparison in the performance measurement. As such, the "SBC Midwest" column has been populated with the "blind replication" status of the "SBCMidwest Affiliate" values.

		The SBC Blind Replication Status Summary as of June 4, 2003 which shows a match "M" for a given measure is inconsistent with a BearingPoint observation associated with the measure which indicates that BearingPoint has not successfully replicated the results for the measure.
		The SBC Blind Replication Status Summary shows that testing remains in progress as of June 23, 2003; however, the related BearingPoint observation indicates that BearingPoint has completed its testing.
		The SBC Blind Replication Status Summary Comment has changed according to the BearingPoint Observation Status Summary dated July 29, 2003.
		BearingPoint has identified an exclusion or business rule discrepancy in an observation issued after June 16, 2003.
		The SBC Blind Replication Status Summary as of June 4, 2003 does not indicate a non-match "NM" result that BearingPoint has subsequently reported in an Observation.

Attachment 8

MR. HORST: I believe that is correct, yes.

MR. GARDON: Did you look at any other performance measures concerning -- when you looked at the billing issue?

MR. HORST: We looked at all performance measurements.

MR. GARDON: Did you look at the other ones though in terms of whether they had any impact or effect on billing related issues?

MR. HORST: Can you be more specific in that question?

MR. COX: When you looked at the accuracy of a bill, what types of bills did you look at?

MR. HORST: We looked at the accuracy and completeness of the company's performance measures.

MR. COX: And that performance measurement looks at what type of bills?

MR. HORST: PM 14 for example relates to Ameritech audits that were performed on three billing systems, ACIS, RBS, and CABS.

The business rules of that particular performance measurement, the purpose of these

audits are to review and recalculate services billed in five states.

This is to ensure that monthly bills sent to the CLECs and repo customers are rated accurately according to the billing tables.

This is performed by extracting recurring, nonrecurring, and usage elements from the above listed billing systems and comparing the billed elements to expected results.

MR. COX: So you did compare the rate tables, the master rate table with what was being billed?

MR. HORST: That's correct.

MR. COX: And you compared it to what data, CLEC, aggregate data, a specific CLEC? What data did you compare it to?

MR. GRAY: For PM 14, is we observed them doing these things and we also did the same, kind of reperformed, as they were pulling out specific CLEC bills and agreeing to them --

MR. COX: During your process analysis for billing only, were you ever given any indication by SBC that they had a problem?

MR. HORST: Not to my knowledge.

MR. COX: They never mentioned that they

had a system -- billing system problem or they were changing billing systems?

MR. HORST: We are aware there is a billing system issue out there when they did convert systems.

However, that is not necessarily something that would be captured in this performance measure.

MR. HEALY: So you said you looked at the billing, whether the rates that appeared on the bills were the rates from the rate tables? Is that what you looked at?

MR. HORST: That's right.

MR. HEALY: So you did not look at whether the bills contained the correct number of units for that rate, i.e., the correct number of new lines installed?

You just looked at whether the line installation rate was the same as the rate table?

MR. HORST: That's correct.

MR. HEALY: Did you look at whether the correct rate got put in the rate table?

MR. HORST: No, we did not.

MR. HEALY: Did you look at whether corrections or bill adjustments were applied

correctly?

MR. HORST: No.

MR. HEALY: Did you look at whether discounts were properly reflected in the rate tables? For instance, the merger condition discounts?

MR. HORST: Not to my knowledge, but again, that is not what this measure is doing.

MR. HEALY: And that is what I am trying to determine. I am trying to determine what it is not doing.

I think we did talk about what it does do.

Did you look at what the correct USOCs were being applied?

MR. HORST: Correct -- you mean --

MR. HEALY: Whether the appropriate USOC was actually being applied for the service actually ordered by the CLEC?

MR. HORST: Verifying that back to a service order.

MR. HEALY: No.

MR. COX: Was anybody from your team ever monitoring or at a six-month review session for performance measurements?

MR. HORST: No, we were not.

MR. COX: Were you aware there was some discussion about billing performance measurements being weak?

MR. HORST: Yes. We have been aware that there has been considerable amount of discussion around the billing measures, that they are not capturing what they are -- what the CLECs would like to have captured.

MR. COX: One last question about billing. What other billing types did you recognize that -- let me rephrase that.

Did you look at a specific CLEC bill when it was a UNE-related type of bill? Specific to UNE loops, for example? Unbundled Network Elements.

MR. HORST: We would have to go back and check.

MR. COX: I would just be curious if you looked at a specific CLEC bill, if the accuracy of that bill from not only the format but the accuracy of what the bill is because --

MR. BOWEN: Accuracy relative to the rate table?

MR. COX: If that's all you can compare

it with --

MR. BOWEN: That was the scope.

MR. COX: Yeah.

MR. HEALY: Do you know if all the possible rates were on the bills you looked at?

In other words, were there elements that simply were not on the sample bills that you looked at so you could not compare them back?

MR. BOWEN: I don't know if I understand the question.

MR. HEALY: The rate table contains rates for a large number of possible things a CLEC could be billed for.

Did you have occasion to examine enough CLEC bills or wide enough sample of CLEC bills so that every element that was in the rate table came out on a CLEC bill and you could compare it?

MR. HORST: Your question is to the adequacy of the company's bill audit sample, right?

And to my knowledge, I don't think we performed procedures around that.

MR. COX: Were you ever aware of any back billing?

MR. HORST: We are aware there were some

billing adjustments made.

MR. COX: And wouldn't that be a first indication there is a billing problem?

MR. HORST: Yes.

MR. COX: And were you not -- focused or scoped to look at that particular problem?

MR. HORST: We were focused on reporting that this measure as designed which is their bill out of process, what is their bill out of process finding and is that being reported?

MR. COX: So I think you are confirming that this performance measurement is not an adequate PM to capture all the billing measures and accuracies of bills, correct?

MR. HORST: That's correct.

MR. COX: So what other billing types would you have looked at or did you look at? Were there any?

Other than the rate table comparison of CABS and ACIS and what was the other one, RBS, that's the scope of what you did?

MR. HORST: That and the other performance measurements.

MR. COX: The other performance measurements for billing?

Attachment 9

> -----Original Message-----
> From: MARIS, STACEY (SBC-MSI) [mailto:sm7542@sbc.com] <mailto:[mailto:sm7542@sbc.com]>
> Sent: Friday, July 11, 2003 9:53 AM
> To: Whiteaker, Kathleen L, CSLSM; MANSIR, TERRI D (SWBT); Mickey Baeza (E-mail); Paananen, Sheila M, CSLSM
> Cc: MCGEE, CELESTE A (SWBT)
> Subject: FW: TX Att17(perf)ver0 3-6-03
>
> Kate,
> Although SBC> '> s 271 obligations, including the obligation to provide performance measurements, will cease with the expiration of the T2A, SBC continues to remain willing to provide a Performance Measures appendix. SBC has two offerings in place that AT&T may consider: 1) the Generic offering found with the Multistate ICA on the website or 2) the attached offering for the T2A Successor Project which has been available on the website since April 21. I understand from your email below that AT&T is not interested in the generic so for your convenience I have attached the T2A Successor PM documents. Terri Mansir has been assigned the responsibility for negotiating this appendix for the T2A Successor Project and is available to schedule a negotiation session with you. Please advise how you wish to proceed.
> Thanks,
> Stacey Maris
> SBC Legal
> 214-464-0228
>

Attachment 10

TABLE OF CONTENTS
PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS

Metric Number:	**Name:**
1	OSS Interface Availability

Definition:

This measures the time during which SBC Southwest's electronic OSS Interfaces for CLECs are actually available, as a percentage of scheduled availability. Because SBC Southwest and CLEC service representatives obtain information from the same underlying legacy OSS, if a particular OSS is down, it is equally unavailable to both SBC Southwest and CLEC employees.

Exclusions:

- Interface outages outside of prime time hours (as published or defined on a state-by-state basis)
- Interface outages reported by a CLEC, but not found to be in SBC Southwest's systems
- Undetected Interface outages reported by a CLEC that were not reported to SBC Southwest's designated trouble reporting center
- Scheduled interface outages for major system releases or system maintenance where CLECs were provided with advanced notification of the downtime in compliance with SBC Southwest's change management process

Business Rules:

The total "number of hours functionality to be available" is the cumulative number of hours (by date and time on a 24 hour clock) over which SWBT plans to offer and support CLEC access to SWBT's operational support systems (OSS) functionality during the reporting period. "Hours Functionality is Available" is the actual number of hours, during scheduled available time, that the SWBT interface is capable of accepting or receiving CLEC transactions or data files. The actual time available is divided by the scheduled time available and then multiplied by 100 to produce the "Percent system availability" measure. SWBT will not schedule normal maintenance during OSS Hours of availability as posted on the CLEC web site unless otherwise notified via an accessible letter. SWBT will not schedule normal maintenance during business hours (8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Monday through Friday). When interfaces experience partial unavailability, an availability factor is applied to the calculation of downtime. This factor is stated as a percentage and represents the impact to the CLEC. Determination of the availability factor is governed by SWBT's Availability Team on a case by case basis. Disputes related to application of the availability factor may be presented to the Commission. Whenever an interface experiences complete unavailability, the full duration of the unavailability will be counted, to the nearest minute, and no availability factor will be applied. SWBT shall calculate the availability time rounded to the nearest minute.

Levels of Disaggregation:

- Verigate
- LEX
- EDI ordering
- EDI pre-ordering
- EBTA

- EBTA GUI
- CORBA

Calculation:	**Report Structure/Geography:**
[(Hours functionality is available during the scheduled available hours) ÷ Scheduled system available hours)] * 100	By interface geography. If an interface serves more than one state, the same performance will be reported for all states served by this interface.

Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:
99.25%

Metric Number:	**Name:**
2	Order Confirmation Timeliness

Definition:

This measures the timeliness of Order Confirmations as the percent of confirmations returned to the CLECs within specified time intervals from receipt of a valid Local Service Request ("LSR") or UNE/Interconnection Trunk Access Service Request ("ASR") to distribution of confirmations. (All service requests will be referred to as LSRs for this measure)

Exclusions:

- Orders submitted manually or by fax which are capable of being submitted electronically
- Orders that fail front-end edits (before the order is submitted to SBC Southwest)
- Rejected LSRs
- Duplicate LSR numbers
- LSR cancelled or supplemented and no confirmation is issued
- LSRs requiring special manual handling
- Test Orders
- SBC Southwest Affiliate (or separate division) Orders
- Weekend and holidays (for manual Intervention)
- Scheduled downtime hours of the service order processor and supporting systems (for electronic/electronic)
- Services ordered out of the access tariff.
- SBC Southwest only disconnect orders

Business Rules:

FOC business rules are established to reflect the Local Service Center (LSC) normal hours of operation, which include Monday through Friday, 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m, excluding holidays and weekends. If the start time is outside of normal business hours, then the start date/time is set to 8:00 a.m. on the next business day. Example: If the request is received Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m.; the valid start time will be Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. If the actual request is received Monday through Thursday after 5:30 p.m. and before 8:00 a.m. the next day; the valid start time will be the next business day at 8:00 a.m. If the actual request is received Friday after 5:30 p.m. and before 8:00 a.m. Monday; the valid start time will be at 8:00 a.m. Monday. If the request is received on a holiday (anytime); the valid start time will be the next business day at 8:00 a.m. For LSRs received electronically requiring no manual intervention by the LSC, the OSS hours of operation will be used in lieu of the LSC hours of operation (i.e., actual OSS processing time outside of LSC hours will not be excluded in calculating the interval). The returned confirmation to the CLEC will establish the actual end date/time. Provisions are established within the DSS reporting systems to accommodate situations when the LSC works holidays, weekends, and when requests are received outside normal working hours. For UNE Loop and Port combinations, orders requiring N, C, and D orders; the FOC is sent back at the time the last order that establishes service is distributed.

All UNE P orders are categorized as Simple or Complex in the same manner as Retail or Resale orders are categorized. All orders that flow through EASE are categorized as Simple and all orders that do not flow through EASE are categorized as Complex.

A Mechanized Business Ordering system (MBOS) document is also required for engineering of trunks that must take place prior to the request being worked. The MBOS form must be initiated by the LSC service representative with information from the LSR for services such as Centrex, DIDs, Plexar I, Package II, Plexar II Basic, Plexar Custom Basic, and PRI services such as Smart Trunks, Select Video, etc. Once the MBOS form is completed, the LSC service representative must release it to the other involved departments for review and determination of the design information and to determine the necessary steps to provide the services. This may involve review of TN number availability, design circuit provisioning, translations requirements, etc. to determine the service availability and due date. Depending on the service and complexity of the request, the return of the MBOS could be 3-5 days. Therefore, the FOC is to be negotiated for any services that require an MBOS.

If the CLEC accesses SWBT systems using a Service Bureau Provider, the measurement of SWBT's performance does not include Service Bureau Provider processing, availability or response time.

LEX/EDI

For LEX and EDI originated LSRs, the start date and time is the receive date and time that is automatically recorded by the interface (EDI or LEX) with the system date and time. The end date and time is recorded by the interface (EDI or LEX) and reflects the actual date and time the FOC is available to the CLEC. For LSRs where FOC times are negotiated with the CLEC, the ITRAK entry on the SORD service order is used in the calculation.

MANUAL REQUESTS

Manual service order requests are those initiated by the CLEC either by telephone, fax, or other manual methods (i.e. courier). The fax receipt date and time is recorded and input on the SM-FID on each service order in SORD for each FOC opportunity. The end time is the actual date and time that a successful attempt to send a paper fax, is made back to the CLEC. If a CLEC does not require a paper fax the FOC information is provided over the phone. In these instances, the order distribution time is used as the FOC end date and time. If a CLEC chooses to receive their FOCs via the Website, the end time is the date and time the FOC is loaded to the Website. The ITRAK-FID is used when FOC times are negotiated with the CLEC. The LSC populates the ITRAK-FID with certain pre-established data entries that are used in the FOC calculation.

Levels of Disaggregation:	
• Electronic/Electronic • Manual Intervention • Interconnection Trunks	
Calculation:	**Report Structure/Geography:**
(Number of CLEC LSRs where the FOC/LSRs is sent on-time) ÷ (Number of CLEC LSRs)	**By State**
Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:	
• 95% on time for Electronic/Electronic • 85% for Manual Intervention On time standard: Simple – 24 hours Complex – 72 hours Unbundled Dedicated Transport DS1/DS3 –5 days • Local Interconnection Facilities and Trunks – 90 % within 10 business days	

Metric Number:	**Name:**
3	**Mechanized Order Completion Notification Timeliness**

Definition:

The percent of Mechanized Order Completion Notifications available within one day of work completion.

Exclusions:

- Test and Administrative Orders
- Canceled service orders
- Orders received manually, e.g. fax or e-mail
- SBC Southwest Affiliate (or separate division) Orders
- Weekends and published holidays

Business Rules:

Days are calculated by subtracting the date the SOC was available to the CLEC via EDI/LEX minus the order completion date. If the CLEC accesses SWBT systems using a Service Bureau Provider, the measurement of SWBT's performance does not include Service Bureau Provider processing, availability or response time.

Levels of Disaggregation:

- None

Calculation:	**Report Structure/Geography:**
(# mechanized completions notifications returned to the CLEC within 1 day of work completion ÷ total mechanized completions notifications) * 100	By state

Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:

95% within 1 day

Metric Number:	**Name:**
4	**Percent SBC Southwest Caused Missed Due Dates**

Definition:

This measures the percentage of orders/items completed after the committed due date. Includes only orders/items with inward activity that have an assigned due date.

Exclusions:

- Canceled service orders
- Test Orders
- Orders that are not N, T, C
- SBC Southwest Affiliate (or separate division) Orders will be excluded from the CLEC Aggregate results
- Administrative Orders
- Orders missed for facility reasons
- Due dates missed solely due to CLEC or customer reasons will be excluded from the numerator.
- NPAC caused misses, unless caused by SBC Southwest
- Excludes Interconnection Trunks

Business Rules:

The due date is the date negotiated by the customer and the SWBT representative for service activation. For CLEC orders, the due date is the due date reflected on the FOC. The Completion Date is the day that SWBT personnel complete the service order activity. POTS, UNE-P and UNE 8db loops are measured at the order level. Resale specials and UNEs are measured at the circuit level.

Levels of Disaggregation:

See Benchmarks.

Calculation:	Report Structure/Geography:
(Number of orders/circuits where the order completion date is greater than the committed due date due to SBC Southwest reasons) ÷ (Total number of orders/circuits)	By state
Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:	
POTS – (Resale RES, BUS & UNE-P) – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – OCn – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – DS3 – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – DS1 – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – DS0 (all VGPL) – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – OCn Loop (loop, transport, Darkfiber & EEL) – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – DS3 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – DS1 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – DS0 Loop (8dB, 5dB, & EEL) – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – DSL Loop (line share, no line share, & IDSL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 5%	

Metric Number:	**Name:**
5	Installation Quality

Definition:

This measures the percentage of lines/circuits installed where a reported trouble was found in the network within 10 calendar days (POTS and 8 dB UNE Loops) or 30 calendar days (all others) of order completion

Exclusions:

- SBC Southwest Affiliate (or separate division) Orders and troubles will be excluded from the CLEC Aggregate
- SBC Southwest Test and Administrative Orders
- Subsequent reports (additional customer calls while the trouble is pending)
- Troubles beyond SBC Southwest's control (e.g., CPE troubles, troubles closed due to customer action, inside wire troubles, Interexchange Carrier/Competitive Access Provider, Informational, etc.)
- Troubles reported on the Order Completion Date, or, trouble reported prior to service order completion in SBC Southwest systems
- Troubles reported but not found (Found OK, Test OK, Came Clear)
- Troubles reported by SBC Southwest employees in the course of performing preventative maintenance, where no customer has reported a trouble
- Troubles for BRI loops without test access
- Troubles for DSL loops > 12,000 feet with load coils, repeaters, and/or excessive bridged tap for which the CLEC has not authorized conditioning, unless trouble found in Central Office
- Troubles caused by a lack of digital test capabilities on BRI and IDSL capable loops when acceptance testing is available but is not selected by the CLEC
- Troubles for UNE loops caused by the lack of loop acceptance testing between the CLEC and SBC Southwest due to CLEC reasons on the due date
- DS1 troubles where CLEC chooses not to do cooperative testing
- Excludes disposition code "13" reports (excludable reports), with the exception of code 1316, unless the trouble report is taken prior to completion of the service order.(Refer to Appendix 2 for list of Excluded "13" disposition codes).
- Excludes Interconnection Trunks

Business Rules:
POTS/UNE-P Includes reports received the day after SWBT personnel complete the service order through 10 calendar days after completion. The denominator for this measure is the total count of orders posted within the reporting month. (However, the denominator will at a minimum equal the numerator). The numerator is the number of trouble reports received within 10 days of service order completion. These will be reported the month that they are closed. This will include troubles taken on the day of completion found to be as a result of a UNE-P conversion. Resale specials A trouble report is counted if it is flagged on WFA (Work Force Administration) as a trouble report that had a service order completion within 30 days. It cannot be a repeat report. The order flagged against must be an addition in order for the trouble report to be counted. Specials are selected based on a specific service code off of the circuit ID. . The denominator for this measure is the total count of orders posted within the reporting month. (However, the denominator will at a minimum equal the numerator). The numerator is the number of trouble reports received within 30 days of service order completion and closed within the reporting month. UNEs A trouble report is counted if it is received within "X" calendar days, where "X" is 10 calendar days for 8db loops and 30 calendar days for all other UNEs, calendar days of a service order completion. UNEs are selected based on a specific service code off of the circuit ID. This measurement is reported at a circuit level. The denominator for this measure is the total count of circuits posted within the reporting month. (However, the denominator will at a minimum equal the numerator). The numerator is the number of trouble reports received within "X" calendar days where "X" is 10 calendar days for 8db loops and 30 calendar days for all other UNEs, calendar days of service order completion that were closed during the reporting month.
Levels of Disaggregation:
See Benchmarks

Calculation:	**Report Structure/Geography:**
Number of trouble reports submitted within 10/30 days of installation activity with trouble found in the network ÷ orders/circuits installed in the calendar month	By state

Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:
POTS – (Resale RES, BUS & UNE-P) – parity with retail Specials Resale – OCn – parity with retail Specials Resale – DS3 – parity with retail Specials Resale – DS1 – parity with retail Specials Resale – DS0 (all VGPL) – parity with retail

Specials Resale – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail
UNE Loop – OCn Loop (loop, transport, Darkfiber & EEL) – parity with retail
UNE Loop – DS3 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity with retail
UNE Loop – DS1 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity with retail
UNE Loop – DS0 Loop (8dB, 5dB, & EEL) – parity with retail
UNE Loop – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail
UNE Loop – DSL Loop (line share, no line share, & IDSL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 5%

Metric Number:	**Name:**
6	Trouble Report Rate

Definition:

Measurement of customer direct or referred troubles reported — other than installation troubles or repeat troubles — where the trouble disposition was found to be in the network, per 100 lines/circuits in service.

Exclusions:

- SBC Southwest Affiliate (or separate division) troubles and lines will be excluded from the CLEC aggregate
- Subsequent reports (additional customer calls while the trouble is pending)
- Troubles beyond SBC Southwest's control (e.g., CPE troubles, troubles closed due to customer action, inside wire troubles, Interexchange Carrier/Competitive Access Provider, Informational, etc.)
- SBC Southwest Test and Administrative Troubles
- Troubles reported by SBC Southwest employees in the course of performing preventative maintenance, where no customer has reported a trouble
- Troubles reported, but not found (e.g., Found OK, Test OK & Came Clear)
- Troubles for BRI loops without test access
- Troubles for DSL loops > 12,000 feet with load coils, repeaters, and/or excessive bridged tap for which the CLEC has not authorized conditioning, unless trouble found in Central Office
- Troubles caused by a lack of digital test capabilities on BRI and IDSL capable loops when acceptance testing is available but is not selected by the CLEC
- Excludes all disposition "13" reports (excludable reports), with the exception of code 1316, unless the report is taken prior to completion of the service order. (Refer to Appendix 2 for list of Excluded "13" disposition codes).
- Stand alone Interconnection Trunks (Specials)

Business Rules

Reports are counted in the month they are reported.

Levels of Disaggregation:

See Benchmarks

Calculation:	Report Structure/Geography:
[Total number of qualifying trouble reports ÷ (Number of lines/circuits in service ÷ 100)]	By state
Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:	
POTS – (Resale RES, BUS & UNE-P) – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – OCn – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – DS3 – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – DS1 – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – DS0 (all VGPL) – parity with retail	
Specials Resale – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail	
UNES Loop – OCn Loop (loop, transport, Darkfiber & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 2%	
UNES Loop – DS3 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 2%	
UNES Loop – DS1 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 2%	
UNES Loop – DS0 Loop (8dB, 5dB, & EEL) – parity with retail	
UNE Loop – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail	
UNES Loop – DSL Loop (line share, no line share, & IDSL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 3%	

Metric Number:	**Name:**
7	Repeat Trouble Report Rate

Definition:

Percentage of additional reported/cleared Network trouble that had a Network trouble cleared within the previous 30 days.

Exclusions:

- Excludes disposition code "13" reports (excludable reports), with the exception of code 1316, unless the report is taken prior to the completion of the service order.
- Interconnection Trunks
- Reported by SBC Southwest employees in the course of performing preventative maintenance, where no customer has reported a trouble
- Troubles beyond the SBC Southwest control(e.g., CPE troubles, troubles closed due to customer action, inside wire troubles, Interexchange Carrier/Competitive Access Provider, Informational, etc.)
- Troubles reported on the Order Completion Date, or, trouble reported prior to service order completion in SBC Southwest systems
- Subsequent reports (additional customer calls while the trouble is pending)
- Troubles reported but not found (e.g. Found OK, Test OK, Came Clear)
- Troubles reported by SBC Southwest employees in the course of performing preventative maintenance, where no customer reported a trouble
- SBC Southwest official or administrative orders
- Troubles for BRI loops without test access
- Troubles for DSL loops > 12,000 feet with load coils, repeaters, and/or excessive bridged tap for which the CLEC has not authorized conditioning, unless trouble found in Central Office
- Troubles caused by a lack of digital test capabilities on BRI and IDSL capable loops when acceptance testing is available but is not selected by the CLEC

Business Rules:

A repeat trouble report is defined as a trouble on the same line/circuit as a previous trouble report (as reported in the installation quality or trouble report rate measurements) that occurred within the last X calendar days (10 days for POTS, UNE-P and 30 days for UNEs and resale specials) of the previous trouble. When the second report is received in X days, the original report is marked as an Original of a Repeat, and the second report is marked as a Repeat. If a third report is received within X days, the second report is marked as an Original of a Repeat as well as being a Repeat, and the third report is marked as a Repeat. In this case there would be two repeat reports. If either

the original or the second report within X days is a measured report, then the second report counts as a Repeat report.
Levels of Disaggregation:
See Benchmarks

Calculation:	**Report Structure/Geography:**
Number of qualifying network troubles ÷ total network troubles found within the calendar month	By state

Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:
POTS – (Resale RES, BUS & UNE-P) – parity with retail
Specials Resale – OCn – parity with retail
Specials Resale – DS3 – parity with retail
Specials Resale – DS1 – parity with retail
Specials Resale – DS0 (all VGPL) – parity with retail
Specials Resale – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail
UNE Loop – OCn Loop (loop, transport, Darkfiber & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 10%
UNE Loop – DS3 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 10%
UNE Loop – DS1 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 10%
UNE Loop – DS0 Loop (8dB, 5dB, & EEL) – parity with retail
UNE Loop – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail
UNE Loop – DSL Loop (line share, no line share, & IDSL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 9%

Metric Number:	**Name:**
8	Mean Time to Restore

Definition:

This measures the average trouble duration interval from trouble receipt to trouble clearance.

Exclusions:

- SBC Southwest Affiliate (or separate division) troubles are excluded from the CLEC aggregate
- Subsequent reports (additional customer calls while the trouble is pending)
- Troubles beyond SBC Southwest's control (e.g., CPE troubles, troubles closed due to customer action, inside wire troubles, Interexchange Carrier/Competitive Access Provider, Informational, etc.)
- Troubles reported but not found (Found OK ,Test OK and Came Clear)
- Troubles reported by employees in the course of performing preventative maintenance, where no customer reported a trouble
- For troubles where the stop clock is used, the time period from when the stop clock is initiated until the time when the clock resumes
- Troubles for BRI loops without test access
- Troubles for DSL loops > 12,000 feet with load coils, repeaters, and/or excessive bridged tap for which the CLEC has not authorized conditioning, unless trouble found in Central Office
- Troubles caused by a lack of digital test capabilities on BRI and IDSL capable loops when acceptance testing is available but is not selected by the CLEC
- Excludes disposition code "13" reports (excludable reports), with the exception of code 1316, unless the report is taken prior to the completion of the service order.
- No access and delayed maintenance

Business Rules:	
Trouble duration intervals may be measured on a running clock or limited stop-clock basis. Running clock includes weekends and holidays. A limited stop clock may be used on Specials Resale and UNES loop products when the customer premises access or access to the circuit, provided by the CLEC and its end user, is after the offered repair interval. A running clock is used for POTS and UNE-P. For example, if customer premises access is not available on a weekend, the clock stops at 5:00 p.m. Friday, and resumes at 8:00 a.m. Monday. This applies to dispatched out tickets only. The clock starts on the date and time SWBT receives a trouble report. The clock stops on the date and time that SWBT personnel clear the repair activity and complete the trouble report in WFA.	
Levels of Disaggregation:	
See Benchmarks	
Calculation:	**Report Structure/Geography:**
Σ[(Date and time trouble report is cleared with the customer) - (date and time trouble report is received)] ÷ total network customer trouble reports	By state
Benchmark/Parity Performance Standard:	
POTS – (Resale RES, BUS & UNE-P) – parity with retail Specials Resale – OCn – parity with retail Specials Resale – DS3 – parity with retail Specials Resale – DS1 – parity with retail Specials Resale – DS0 (all VGPL) – parity with retail Specials Resale – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail UNE Loop – OCn Loop (loop, transport, Darkfiber & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 3.0 hours UNE Loop – DS3 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 3.0 hours UNE Loop – DS1 Loop (loop, transport & EEL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 4.0 hours UNE Loop – DS0 Loop (8dB, 5dB, & EEL) – parity with retail UNE Loop – ISDN & BRI – parity with retail UNE Loop – DSL Loop (line share, no line share, & IDSL) – parity if retail exist otherwise 9.0 hours	